



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 163

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 2017

No. 35

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (MR. JODY B. HICE of Georgia).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,

February 28, 2017.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JODY B. HICE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

PAUL D. RYAN,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2017, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

FIX OUR BROKEN IMMIGRATION SYSTEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BARRAGÁN) for 5 minutes.

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce my guest for tonight's joint session of Congress. Roque Pech is a constituent of mine from California's 44th District. He lives in Wilmington. He came to this country at the age of 3 years old. His parents were from Mexico, coming here for a better life for their kids. His parents were hardworking, getting odd jobs,

blue-collar workers, really trying to make it.

Now, Roque is a beneficiary of DACA. He is a DREAMer; somebody who was looking forward to going to college, was able to go to undergrad and even go to graduate school, where he studied education. He is one of the many faces of DREAMers whom our country has benefited from DACA. As a teacher, he helps other students who are struggling in math. He is a sixth grade teacher who looks into the eyes of kids who dream big, who want to make it, and he instills in them some hope.

Tonight, Roque will be up in this gallery for the first time, looking down on a President who has been demeaning immigrants, who hasn't seen the value of what immigrants provide to this country.

Now, this is very personal for me. My parents are also immigrants from Mexico. They came here because they wanted a better life for their kids. And I beat the odds. I got a piece of the American Dream, and now I fight for those to make sure that others have the same opportunity.

Roque has been spared from the deportations. He is an example of immigrants that continue to contribute to our country. He also sits on the Wilmington Neighborhood Council, where he provides input and is active in the community. Because of DACA, hundreds of kids are benefiting from him being a teacher.

I believe we continue to need comprehensive immigration reform to fix our broken immigration system. It is the best answer. Until then, I am going to continue to fight to protect hardworking families and immigrants who continue to provide value, DREAMers like Roque, who only know the United States as their home. He is American in every way.

A STRONGER STANCE ON RUSSIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, Vladimir Putin's regime has long sought to undermine U.S. interests and shape a world more compliant with its corruption. I have argued for a stronger stance against Russia for years. I opposed the Obama administration's failed reset of relations.

I helped lead the push for greater sanctions on Russia's human rights violators, helping secure passage of the Sergei Magnitsky Act.

I have called for sanctions against those who poisoned my friend, Vladimir Kara-Murza, and against all those involved in the murder of opposition leader Boris Nemtsov, the 2-year anniversary of which occurred just yesterday.

I also support the efforts to codify sanctions against Russia and to limit the lifting of executive waivers. But we should be limiting the ability to waive sanctions not just on Russia, but also on Iran, on the Palestinian Authority, and on so many others because, in order for sanctions to be effective, they must be fully implemented and fully enforced.

LET'S HELP OUR GREAT NATION STAY GREAT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. CORREA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, tonight at the President's address, I will be joined by a young man, Eliel Aguilon, a new American, in the great tradition of this great country.

Eliel grew up surrounded by poverty, yet he found his path to the American Dream through hard work and education. Eliel is my neighbor. He attended the same public high school

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H1359

that my daughter attends. He is the first person in his family to attend college, and his goal is to earn a Ph.D. in engineering and to address our Nation's affordable housing crisis. Today, Eliel encourages young students to pursue careers in science and math.

Eliel is a DACA student. Let me repeat. Eliel is a DACA student. He and his family left Mexico when he was 7 years old to pursue the American Dream through hard work and dedication.

We must ensure that Eliel and hundreds of other hardworking DACA students stay in America, the only home they have known, so that they can also contribute to the greatness of our great country. DACA students are our new Americans.

Let us help our great Nation stay great. Let us do the right thing. Let's give our DACA students and other hardworking taxpayers in our Nation a pathway to citizenship.

VICTIMS OF TRAFFICKING DO NOT BELONG IN SHACKLES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in her formative years, Lena wore turtle-necks and baggy clothes to school every day.

Why did she do so?

To hide the bruises that covered her entire body.

Soon, Lena's abusive foster mother lost custody of her. And when her foster mother lost custody, Lena just ran away. She was 13.

After bolting from the front lawn at the Houston middle school, she ran into a friendly-looking stranger, and that is when she discovered a false sense of comfort in the hands of a dastardly human trafficker. He offered to look after her, protect her, and love her; that was if she made him a little money. And he offered her the one thing she was missing in her 13 years, someone who said they loved her.

Mr. Speaker, love doesn't come with black eyes and bruises, however. The trafficker even promised Lena drugs so she could focus on something else while she was having sex with the buyers of children.

For the next 3 months, Lena would have many different traffickers and many different buyers. She would spend a few months or weeks with them, moving from motel to motel, then she would get scared and try to go back to foster care, and then just disappear again.

Finally, she was arrested after police responded to an internet post advertising sex with children. They arrested her trafficker in the hotel next door. With her help, the police ultimately charged two individuals with forcing a child into prostitution, or human trafficking, as we call it.

Upon her arrest, it was revealed that not only did she have three sexually

transmitted diseases, she was also pregnant.

The problem then, Mr. Speaker, is that Lena had nowhere to go. Authorities found themselves with an abused, traumatized, demoralized trafficking victim, a child, on their hands. Remember, Lena was a victim of crime. She was not a criminal. Children cannot be willing prostitutes under the law.

But there were no resources to put her anywhere, no resources to get her help and the support that she needed. The very limited number of nearby trafficking shelters were all full and there was no place to send her, so she was locked up in the county jail.

Victims of trafficking, Mr. Speaker, do not belong in shackles and orange jumpsuits. They belong in safe, nurturing environments. They deserve to have access to resources and help to get their stolen lives back for them.

How can a victim begin to recover, while a child, languishing in jail?

The justice system failed Lena and many others just like her, but it doesn't have to be this way. Lena deserves justice.

Sitting here in Washington, D.C., there is a victims' fund totaling over \$12 billion. Money in this fund comes from fines and fees imposed on convicted felons, people like deviants who trafficked Lena. Unfortunately, year after year, only a small amount of this money is actually taken out of the fund to help victims. Most of it stays in the fund and is used by appropriators to offset the costs of their pet projects that have nothing to do with victims of crime.

This is not acceptable, Mr. Speaker. The money, remember, is not taxpayer money. It is money that comes from criminals when they are convicted in Federal court, and we should give this money to victims of crime.

Money in the fund should be spent only on what victims like Lena desperately need so that they can get their lives back together and recover from the trafficking abuse they suffered.

Lena and other trafficking victims deserve justice. They deserve the money that is in the fund, and bureaucrats need to quit using that money as an offset for other projects. The victim fund is partially the answer.

Mr. Speaker, this should be spent on victims of crime because no trafficking victim belongs in the shackles of a county jail.

And that is just the way it is.

SENSELESS ACTS OF GUN VIOLENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TORRES) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Jonah Min Hwang, another victim of a senseless act of gun violence. Jonah was only 8 years old when he was killed last

week in a drive-by shooting in my home city of Pomona.

Jonah, his parents, and his brother were enjoying dinner hosted by friends of his parents, two schoolteachers, when a bullet ripped through the house and hit Jonah. Crimes like this are heartbreaking.

A talented soccer player, an avid reader who loved superheroes, Jonah was an adopted child from a Taiwanese orphanage just 3 years ago. It eats at your soul to think that such a young child with his whole life ahead of him could be taken so ruthlessly. Perhaps most frustrating is that Jonah's killer is still at large.

When I first heard of Jonah's death, it brought me back to a similar tragedy when I served as mayor of my home city of Pomona. In 2006, little Ethan Esparza was shot and killed while he was playing in his front yard during his birthday party. He would have turned 4 years old.

Ethan's murder shocked our community and was a stark reminder of the violence that plagues our city. Sadly, over 10 years later, we are still fighting those same battles.

The murders of Jonah and Ethan were completely senseless, but they are not rare. In fact, Pomona was recently ranked California's eighth most dangerous city, which doesn't surprise those of us who have seen gangs take ahold of our city.

Our local police department puts their lives on the line every single day to try to keep us safe, and our local officials have made significant investments in law enforcement. During my time as mayor, we implemented gang injunctions to try to get hold of the problem.

□ 1015

But as the number of guns on the streets continues to rise and ruthless gang members get their hands on these deadly weapons, it often feels like a losing battle. We are alone fighting these battles.

As a matter of fact, today marks the 23rd anniversary of the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act, better known as the Brady bill, which has blocked more than 3 million people who had no business owning a gun from buying a gun from a federally licensed dealer.

As the new President makes his first address to Congress today, it is especially infuriating that, despite the countless gun-related tragedies occurring across our country, this Congress and this new administration have not taken one single step to reduce gun violence. I have come to this floor before demanding action, and I stand here before you yet again today, Mr. Speaker, to demand action on behalf of Jonah, of Ethan, and of the millions of innocent lives lost.

There are steps that we can take immediately to expand the Brady bill to save lives and make our communities safer:

First, we should close the loophole that allows guns to be sold online or at gun shows without background checks.

Second, we should make sure that there are resources available to research gun violence—research. We can't find effective solutions if we can't research and understand the problem.

Lastly, we should enhance the National Instant Criminal Background Check System, NICS, and make sure that States are inputting records in a way that allows Federal agencies to run complete background checks on individuals. Background checks are only as effective as the quality of the records in the background check system.

There is no excuse for making it easy for dangerous people to get their hands on a deadly weapon. It is my deepest hope that this Congress will take action on gun control so that none of us has to attend another vigil in Pomona—or anywhere else in America—to honor the memory of another child taken from us much too soon. We owe it to the victims and to their loved ones to act.

AFRICAN AMERICAN HISTORY MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO) for 5 minutes.

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today not only to celebrate African American History Month, but to celebrate two stories lost to mainstream history. The first story is the original Underground Railroad, and the other story is of Josiah T. Walls.

Students across the country have heard stories about the Underground Railroad during the Antebellum Period; however, there was a Road to Freedom that existed before the United States was even established, and that road went south to the free territory of Spanish Florida. In fact, the National Park Service held its sixth annual Underground Railroad Conference in St. Augustine in 2012 to highlight this very story which started with eight recorded families seeking freedom in 1608 in Florida.

During this period, thousands of men, women, and children fled from the colonies of North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia. These individuals headed to Florida to gain their freedom thanks to the Edict of 1693, which was issued by the then-Spanish Government that stated that any man, woman, or child who found their way to Spanish Florida would be granted freedom.

The people at the heart of this story are the Gullah Geechee who trace their lineage to West Africa. Once free in Florida, the Gullah Geechee people thrived, establishing communities, forts, and deep roots throughout Florida's Third Congressional District, roots that still can be felt today.

The second story is of Josiah T. Walls. He was a man who was born into slavery in 1842 in Virginia. He worked as a slave. The Civil War broke out,

and he was conscripted by the Confederate Army to serve as a cook in the Civil War. He got freed by the Union soldiers, served with the Union soldiers, and after the war, he moved to Florida to fight in the Seminole American wars. During that time period, the war ended, and he moved to Gainesville, Florida, where he became the first African-American mayor of our city where I come from.

During that time, he became a very successful businessperson. He was elected to the Florida Assembly, and then later he was elected to the U.S. Congress, serving in this very body here today. His elections got challenged, and he lost his role as a Representative in the House. He ran again the next year, won again, and served a full term. Then the third term he ran, he won again. His election got challenged by a Confederate soldier, and he lost his seat.

He went on to become a prominent businessman in north central Florida, owned a farm, and was very successful until the freeze of 1906, which put him out of business. He moved to Tallahassee and became a newspaper owner and printed a local newspaper.

He rose to prominence, but at his death, he was but a footnote in the histories not just of our State, but of our country. Here is a man that was born into slavery, rose to prominence, and was forgotten by history.

I tell these stories because these stories, like many stories in our early history, must never be forgotten and must be remembered by our history lest we repeat it. It must also be taught to our children so that they are inspired and they see themselves in the history books like these other folks.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 21 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Chaplain Harvey Klee, American Legion National Chaplain, Bluffton, Texas, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we thank You when heroic leadership has been undertaken in this House during times of crises, for their labor well into the night, for efforts to seek compromise where compromise is warranted, and for creative solutions proposed and acted upon in the best interests of the American people.

May unity prevail even when parties are in conflict. When progress is impeded and negotiations break down, grant them fresh ideas for discussion and ultimate resolution.

May all Members of this House remain faithful to the oath of office they have taken as Representatives of "We the people . . ." and may political ideologies be tempered by intellectual honesty.

Lord, bless this land we love so much and save us from our own self-inflicted wounds.

This we pray in the name of all that is holy.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. ENGEL led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

WELCOMING CHAPLAIN HARVEY KLEE

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a constituent of mine who is here with us today. Chaplain Harvey H. Klee, a resident of Llano, Texas, joins us today as the national chaplain of the American Legion.

We just heard Chaplain Klee give a beautiful invocation, calling for us all to be unified in our actions, with the best interest of the American people at heart. Chaplain Klee has dedicated himself to living by those words, serving our Nation and its people in many ways.

Chaplain Klee served in the Navy during the Korean war and later worked as a missionary helping drug addicts and designing training programs for inmates at a prison in California.

Later, he founded the Texas Chaplains Association, and has been appointed Texas Department Chaplain nine times, which is more times than any other chaplain in the history of the department.

Chaplain Klee, thank you for joining us today and reminding us of the great power of our Lord, Jesus Christ.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky). The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

WELCOMING DR. MONA HANNA-ATTISHA TO THE JOINT SESSION OF CONGRESS

(Mr. KILDEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I am proud today to have Dr. Mona Hanna-Attisha, the daughter of Iraqi-American scientists, the physician who helped expose the Flint water crisis, as my guest at the joint session and the address by the President tonight.

Simply put, Dr. Mona, as her patients call her, is a hero. Her persistence exposed a terrible manmade crisis that poisoned my hometown, and she has been an incredible partner in the fight for resources to help fix the problems in Flint. Her personal story of coming to America from Iraq reminds us of the many important contributions that immigrants make.

In Donald Trump's world, though, Dr. Mona may not have been there for Flint kids. She is an Iraqi immigrant. In Donald Trump's world, she would actually have been turned away. She would not have been the hero to thousands of Flint families.

She is the epitome of what makes America great and what it means to be an American citizen. She stood up for what was right. She exposed the facts in Flint, Michigan. In the face of bullying, she spoke truth to power, and she persisted. She is a hero. She is what makes this country great. She is what is good about the United States of America—an immigrant to this country who stood for the people of my hometown.

She is a message, and her presence here today is intended to send a message to the President of the United States and to the rest of the country that that is what makes America great. She adds to the fabric of this country, and I am grateful to have her here today.

REVOKE PASSPORTS OF THOSE WHO JOIN FOREIGN TERRORIST ORGANIZATIONS

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, over 260 Americans have traveled to Iraq and Syria to fight for known foreign terrorist organizations. When they return back to America, they are not coming back to open up coffee shops. They are coming back to do mischief against us.

The most important job of government is to protect the citizens. That is why my colleague, BILL KEATING, and I

have introduced the Foreign Terrorist Organization Passport Revocation Act. It directs the Secretary of State to revoke passports of those Americans who have joined foreign terrorist organizations. They are still citizens, but they cannot travel back to the United States or to any other country. The only way they come back to the United States is under arrest by law enforcement in handcuffs.

This is a bipartisan bill that will stop these Benedict Arnolds from coming back at all. If someone takes arms up with our enemies, that person deserves to be treated like an enemy.

And that is just the way it is.

WELCOMING BRUCE BAILLIE TO THE JOINT SESSION OF CONGRESS

(Mr. KILMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, when you come in to Bremerton, Washington, on the ferry, you see one of my favorite sights. It is Building 460 of the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard, and it says on the side of the building: "Puget Sound Naval Shipyard Building on a Proud Tradition." Puget Sound Naval Shipyard is far and away the largest employer in the region I represent, and these are men and women who take great pride in their work and have done so for over 125 years.

They are also critical to the success of our Navy's national security mission, but too often in this town, they don't get the respect they deserve. That is why my guest this evening is Bruce Baillie with the Bremerton Building and Metal Trades Council. Bruce is a local leader for our shipyard workers, and I want to make sure that this new administration understands how important this workforce is to our country.

These are not just talented professionals. They have been amazing partners in putting together an action agenda for shipyard workers that we introduced last week: exempting our shipyard workers from the hiring freeze which is critical to our Nation's security, making sure that retired servicemembers—our veterans—are able to secure jobs in our Defense Department, and halting policies that lower the compensation of defense workers—changes in per diem and overtime policies that affect their take-home pay.

It is important that we have the backs of these vital workers, and that is why I have invited Bruce Baillie as my guest this evening.

RARE DISEASE WEEK ON CAPITOL HILL

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this week marks Rare

Disease Week on the Hill. Many Members of this House will meet with patients, caregivers, physicians, family members, and advocates from across the country about how their lives are impacted by disease.

The National Institutes of Health considers a disease rare if it affects fewer than 200,000 people across the United States. Many times the disease is accompanied by uncommon or mismatched symptoms that make diagnosing the illness difficult, and many times such illnesses are without a cure.

Mr. Speaker, before I came to Congress, I was a healthcare professional, and I have seen firsthand how devastating a disease or injury can be to an individual and to families.

I welcome the rare disease community to Washington this week, and I look forward to meeting with Representatives from the Fifth District of Pennsylvania, including Tom Weiser, James and Jean Rickard from Bellefonte, Pennsylvania.

Education can help shape healthcare policy, Mr. Speaker, to better meet the needs of the rare disease community, and I am pleased to be a part of that conversation.

DONALD TRUMP AND VLADIMIR PUTIN

(Ms. KELLY of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, last week I hosted a dozen of constituent events in my district. At every turn, families asked the same question: When will Congress investigate the President's involvement with Russia?

I have received many calls and e-mails about Russia for weeks. The American people are deeply and rightly concerned with this administration's involvement with the Putin regime. We know the President's hand-picked national security adviser was forced to resign over his communications with Russia. We know that if Moscow did indeed influence our free elections, we have a duty to stand up against those threats and not sweep them under the rug.

We do not support Putin's human rights record, his treatment of journalists, or his invasions of Georgia and Ukraine, where my grandmother was born.

So why is the people's House protecting Vladimir Putin? Why are we not standing up to President Trump and investigating his dealings with the Putin regime? What are we afraid of?

To my colleagues on the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee, what are you afraid we will find out if we investigate?

Mr. Speaker, when are we going to get answers for the American people?

Lastly, I welcome Chicago WVON's Matt McGill and Planned Parenthood's Donna Miller to tonight's joint session.

E PLURIBUS UNUM

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, what a wonderful country that we live in. It is wonderful because we have come—maybe some because of the Statue of Liberty's wonderful words or others who have come in different ways, we are different, but we are one.

Tonight in his message, wouldn't it be well to focus on our unity and not our divisiveness?

Since the election, there have been 1,000 hate crimes. And, of course, in the last 72 hours to last week, two Indo Americans—Indians—engineers, one dead, one shot. And the perpetrator indicated in his words: I shot two Middle Easterners.

What kind of hate is being generated?

It has been generated, and it needs to cease. We need to have a speech tonight that will speak to the unity, speak against anti-Semitism and the attacks that are going on the Jewish community. We need to recognize the distinctions and the differences. We need to stop the siege against Hispanics, mass deportation, African-American discrimination and others, women and many others.

This needs to be a time of unity, respect, and dignity. I will be waiting to hear and to see what kind of America are we going to be guided by and what kind of America will we live in?

I hope for the best.

ACCESS TO QUALITY HEALTH CARE

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, health care is important to every family in America. The Affordable Care Act increased access to health care for about 20 million Americans.

Is the Affordable Care Act perfect?

No bill that has ever been debated on this floor and passed is perfect.

Let's make our goal not to have anyone who received access to health care to lose it. We need to make it better and to guarantee access to quality health care for all Americans. America can do better.

PRESIDENT TRUMP NEEDS TO WORK WITH ALL PEOPLE

(Mr. ENGEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I have long prided myself on working across the aisle to get things done for my constituents and all the American people. That is what the American people want: a government that grapples with tough issues in a constructive way.

Unfortunately, since January 20, the new administration has shown no interest in working with the Congress on both sides to tackle problems, including Russia's unlawful interference in last year's election. That is why I decided not to stand on the aisle in the House Chamber to shake the President's hand during the joint session of Congress, as I have done in the past through Democratic and Republican administrations alike. This will be the first time during my 29 years in this House I have made this decision.

I have deep respect for the Presidency, and I will attend the joint session, but that respect between the branches must be mutual. The President has attacked the free press by calling it the enemy of the people. He has rejected America's traditional role welcoming refugees who have helped to make our country great. He has cozied up to Vladimir Putin, the strongman who attacks our democracy. He has moved to gut the Affordable Care Act. He has looked the other way when threats against the Jewish community have increased in the recent year.

This isn't part of our normal political discourse. This goes beyond ideological and political differences. The President needs to work with all people. Therefore, I will listen to what he has to say today, but I will not greet him and shake his hand.

□ 1215

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 998, SEARCHING FOR AND CUTTING REGULATIONS THAT ARE UNNECESSARILY BURDENSOME ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 83, DISAPPROVING THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR RELATING TO "CLARIFICATION OF EMPLOYER'S CONTINUING OBLIGATION TO MAKE AND MAINTAIN AN ACCURATE RECORD OF EACH RECORDABLE INJURY AND ILLNESS"

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 150 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 150

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 998) to provide for the establishment of a process for the review of rules and sets of rules, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be

considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 83) disapproving the rule submitted by the Department of Labor relating to "Clarification of Employer's Continuing Obligation to Make and Maintain an Accurate Record of Each Recordable Injury and Illness". All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the joint resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce; and (2) one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on House Resolution 150, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring forward this rule on behalf of the Rules Committee. The rule provides for consideration of H.R. 998, the SCRUB Act, and H.J. Res. 83, a resolution disapproving a Department of Labor rule relating to employee recordkeeping.

The rule provides for 1 hour of debate for each piece of legislation, equally divided between the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform and the

chairman and ranking member of the Education and the Workforce Committee. The rule also provides for a motion to recommit for both pieces of underlying legislation. Additionally, the rule makes in order 12 amendments—11 from our friends across the aisle—to the SCRUB Act.

Yesterday, the Rules Committee had the opportunity to hear from Chairman CHAFFETZ and Congressman CARTWRIGHT on behalf of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, and Congressmen BYRNE and COURTNEY on behalf of the Education and the Workforce Committee.

Both pieces of legislation before us today take steps to remove unnecessary burdens that the government has levied on hardworking Americans from coast to coast. The regulatory burden in this country is staggering. In fact, the Code of Federal Regulations spans more than 178,000 pages and contains more than 1 million regulatory restrictions.

Let's let that sink in for just a moment, Mr. Speaker. Let's think about that for a second. 178,000 pages and over 1 million regulatory restrictions. An average of nearly 12,000 new restrictions are added each year.

Let me be clear. Some regulations are necessary. They are completely what we need to have. I don't believe that all regulation is bad. So before we go down that path, let me just say that this is a fact, and we can continue this.

I believe we need clean air, clean water, smart standards for how we handle nuclear energy, and worker protections, just to name a few. I also believe that we have allowed the regulatory scheme to run amok. Congress has ceded power to agencies, which have implemented more and more regulations, oftentimes with less and less benefit to Americans.

Far too many regulations offer our citizens minimal benefits at confounding cost. Taxpayers and businesses alike are withering under regulations that are outdated, irrelevant, and nonsensical.

Do we really need a regulation to mandate what kind of latch a baker uses on a flour bin? Do we really want to tell people that their dishwashers are forbidden to use enough water to actually clean their dishes, forcing them to wash their dishes twice rather than it actually conserving water?

Unfortunately, these stories aren't works of fiction. They are real regulations put in place by Federal agencies. We have to take steps to restore common sense to the regulatory process and clean up the regulation roster.

It is time we identify and abolish those regulations that are pointless, those that prevent people from doing their jobs, and those that are inefficient and ineffective. The SCRUB Act, Mr. Speaker, takes steps to do just that and contributes to our efforts to rein in overregulation.

The SCRUB Act, introduced by my friend from Missouri, Congressman

JASON SMITH, establishes a bipartisan Retrospective Regulatory Review Commission to identify unnecessary rules that are hindering economic growth. The commission will then identify which rules need to be repealed immediately and which ones can be addressed by more flexible procedures outlined in the legislation.

The commission will report these findings to Congress, and Congress can then vote on these recommendations and take steps either to begin immediately repealing regulations or implementing a CutGo process.

Importantly, the commission created by the SCRUB Act will also ensure that redundant regulations from different agencies will be reviewed. Currently, agencies implement their directives absent a systemwide view, meaning that overlapping and even conflicting regulations are enacted far too often.

From conversations with my constituents in northeast Georgia, I have witnessed how overregulation is stifling growth in our communities. The remedy for this economic anemia is to get unnecessary regulations off the books and, instead, focus on enforcing regulations that are actually achieving benefits for our neighbors.

The second piece of legislation that this rule provides for also returns us to reasonable policies that reinstate the spirit of the law. H.J. Res. 83, introduced by my fellow Rules Committee member, Congressman BYRNE from Alabama, utilizes the Congressional Review Act to overturn a rule from the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, or OSHA.

Worker protections are critically important, yet they lose their purpose when they fail to protect workers and jobs effectively. Too often, OSHA forgets that mission, and the rule we are talking about today is the latest example of misguided regulatory zeal.

In the waning days of the previous administration, OSHA put forth a final rule implementing punitive standards on employers, a move that contradicts the underlying statute. Under the law, employers are required to record and maintain logs of workplace injuries and illnesses that occur during a 5-year period; however, the employers can only be cited for recordkeeping violations within a 6-month time period.

Now, think about what was just said here. They have to keep it for 5 years, but they can only be cited for violations within a 6-month time period.

This arrangement is constructive. Logs should be kept up to date so that businesses can make informed decisions about health and safety in the workplace. This requirement encourages businesses to improve safety measures in a timely manner. However, the previous administration decided to rewrite the law through regulation in a way that penalizes and burdens small businesses without achieving meaningful benefit. OSHA finalized a rule that would extend the threat of penalty for recordkeeping violations up to 5 years.

Aside from ignoring existing law and court decisions that directly contradict this new regulation, OSHA has chosen to punish small businesses for paperwork violations rather than focusing resources on improving worker safety.

We can agree that keeping our workplaces safe is nonnegotiable, but OSHA has repeatedly overstepped its mission in order to collect fines and apply oppressive rules at the expense of opportunities to cultivate healthier working conditions. It is time to bring this regulatory mischief to an end, which is why I am glad to see this resolution of disapproval to overturn the most recent OSHA overstep.

Mr. Speaker, both the SCRUB Act and the resolution of disapproval provided for by this rule take common-sense steps to unlock the regulatory shackles Federal agencies have put on our economy and taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank the gentleman from Georgia, my friend, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes for debate.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to debate the rule for consideration. As my friend across the aisle has already noted, this rule bundles together two unrelated pieces of legislation. We are developing a pattern here of doing that in the Rules Committee.

The first of these is H.J. Res. 83, a Congressional Review Act resolution of disapproval that seeks to overturn a Department of Labor rule on workplace injuries, undermining workplace safety and health in the process.

The second measure is H.R. 998, the SCRUB Act, which establishes a new commission to review Federal regulations with the aim of needlessly politicizing and, thereby, undermining the regulatory framework that keeps our air clean and our water safe to drink.

I note that my friend on the other side of the aisle did not mention that this commission will cost \$30 million for work that last night's presenter at the Rules Committee said that Congress can do, the argument being that Congress doesn't have enough staff so we are going to send it over to nine people and pay \$30 million, starting, to have them do the work that we in Congress should be doing.

Beginning with the CRA resolution—the 14th such resolution considered by the House this month—the Republican leadership is continuing its onslaught against well-thought-out and measured regulations. I get it. Republicans control the House, the Senate, and the White House. They are desperately trying to ram through their priorities before anyone notices what they are doing.

It is interesting to me, Mr. Speaker, where the Republican majority has focused its attention throughout the past month. I can't help but notice that 40 days into Donald John Trump's administration, he has not put forth one single jobs measure. Democrats, on the

other hand, continue to talk about the need for good, well-paying jobs. The United States Senate put out the Democrats' trillion-dollar jobs plan that anybody can read on their website on where we stand when it comes to well-paying jobs.

Yet, as we advocate for our plan to rebuild our Nation's infrastructure and create over 15 million jobs in the process, Republicans pass measures to drug-test applicants for unemployment insurance and repeal rules that require Federal contractors to disclose violations of Federal labor and worker safety laws.

This resolution repeals a Department of Labor rule pertaining to the Occupational Safety and Health Administration. The rule in question requires employers to keep and maintain accurate records of every recordable injury and illness in federally mandated logs for a period of 5 years.

It is worth mentioning that this policy has been upheld in cases dating back to 1993. The rule, when implemented, added zero new compliance obligations, zero new reporting obligations, and cost a total of—you guessed it—zero dollars. Yet, once again, this is what we are spending our time on this week: repealing a thoughtful rule designed to protect workers.

I am particularly concerned by this resolution as it actually jeopardizes workplace safety by allowing employers to avoid penalties for the underreporting of injuries over many years. Longstanding workplace hazards will and can certainly be masked.

□ 1230

This makes it less likely that employers or employees will take corrective actions or that OSHA will find the hazards when they do an inspection, leaving workers in danger.

It is also worth noting that due to its very small budget, OSHA is only able to inspect a workplace, on average, once every 140 years. You heard me correctly, once every 140 years. That makes data even more important. Yet, by diminishing the reliability of a worksite's injury data, which some employers systematically underreport, this resolution also takes away OSHA's ability to protect workers from the most significant hazards.

Mr. Speaker, throughout the past week, concerned Americans attended town halls across the country, and for those who were actually able to meet with their Republican representative in Congress, the conversations focused on protecting health care, creating jobs, and protecting the environment. At these meetings, constituents did not ask for fewer workplace protections, they did not ask for Congress to act to make it easier for people with severe mental illness to purchase guns, they didn't ask for Congress to ease disclosure requirements for oil companies making payments to foreign governments, and yet these are the things the Republican majority has already chosen to focus on this month.

Watching the news, I did not hear one person say: if only Congress would repeal anticorruption rules, undermine my retirement security, and then allow endangered animals on national wildlife refuges to be killed using inhumane methods, if only Congress would do these things, my life would be better. Not one person, Mr. Speaker. Yet, in the past month, the House voted to do all of the things that I just mentioned. I submit to the American people watching at home right now that this is the face of today's Republican Party. Tell me who you think is really on your side.

Turning our attention to the SCRUB Act, this bill would establish a \$30 million commission with unlimited subpoena authority that is empowered to dismantle long-established, science-based public health and safety standards. The SCRUB Act would undermine the ability of agencies to react to immediate public health threats by adopting the regulatory CutGo process. The CutGo system is, in my opinion, completely detached from reality. This requirement will prohibit agencies from issuing any new rules, even in the case of emergencies or imminent harm to the public, until they repeal an existing rule to offset the cost. Along with bills that have already come to the House floor under this Republican Congress, as well as Donald Trump's executive actions mandating a regulatory freeze, this legislation demonstrates a continued attack on standards set in place to protect American families.

I guess it is not all that surprising that my Republican friends are pushing through legislation that prioritizes corporate profit over health and safety of the American people. Whether it is denying access to women's health care or rolling back environmental protections, Republicans are making it clear where their allegiances lie. For a party that prides itself on being anti-red tape, the SCRUB Act strangely duplicates existing requirements to conduct retrospective reviews of rules, rules on top of rules on top of rules. Our regulatory system should work for all American families and encourage companies to run safe, forward-thinking businesses. This legislation would move us in the opposite direction.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I enjoy coming down here. I love being a part of debating and coming here to the floor. My friend from Florida and I do that quite regularly in the Committee on Rules, and it is a good thing. He has brought up a lot of bills over the last month. He listed out a list of horrors that was all discussed on this floor. I would encourage everyone to go back and look at the other side, as Paul Harvey used to say, and the rest of the story. So for all the list of horrors, Mr. Speaker, we also

need to balance on the votes that were cast on this floor and the debate had on this floor was not a one-sided affair. It was two, and the applicants were going.

The other thing that just struck me, Mr. Speaker, was this, especially dealing with the CRA, the records. It was interesting to see that this was a carefully thought-out proposal. It was not a carefully thought-out proposal. It was a reaction to a 2012 court case, the *Volks* case, in which the three D.C. Appellate Court judges, including Henderson, Brown, and Garland, said: OSHA, you can't do this, you can't go back and maintain the records and then only be able—what the law actually says is, punish within 6 months of this.

So this is not long and thought out. It was a way, as was established in the *Volks* case, actually the case said: "We do not believe Congress"—these were the judges speaking—"expressly established a statute of limitations only to implicitly encourage the Secretary to ignore it."

So this goes back to the heart, Mr. Speaker. If we are wanting to discuss the face of a Republican majority that is listening to the Constitution and the American people saying we need relief from some of these regulatory burdens in which good people—I will never not state that good people work in these agencies, but when you give good people a job, and you tell them to go do something and to sit in their cubicles or sit in their offices and say how can I come up with more regulatory, they are going to do it. Americans are the best workers in the world. They are going to use their talents.

The problem is when you put them in a position in which many times their talents do not equal what is happening in the real world. Mr. Speaker, you have seen that in your State. I have seen that in my State. In fact, we have seen it in Florida, as well, and other States. It is simply bringing us back to commonsense reasoning in this in saying why, when you cannot by law punish this, why are you keeping it?

The court actually also made an interesting statement as well in this, and in one of the footnotes it said: "That OSHA did not cite *Volks* for a failure to retain injury records when that is the only conduct for which the statute of limitations would not have clearly expired suggests that OSHA had, at some point, correctly understood that an unmade record cannot be said to have not been retained and that an employer's obligations with respect to making and keeping records are distinct."

The idea that you are somehow going to harm recordkeeping here—which is a separate violation, by the way, which has nothing to do with the keeping of the records 5 years, let's at least get this process straight here. If you do not, as an employer, record workplace injuries and record these incidents, you are in an issue there. You are violating the law there. So let's look at this.

OSHA has a great place. It should be the teaching arm. It should be the encouraging arm for every employer to look to for best practices and standards on how to do what I believe every employer here inherently gets up every morning wanting to do. They do not want to have a workforce that is hurt, maimed, or put at risk in their jobs every day.

Instead, OSHA has morphed, over time, and this body is partially to blame. It has morphed into something that, frankly, has left its Occupational Safety and Health Administration. It has become punitive. It has become a way of not being helpful, but yet actually hurtful in the marketplace.

So as we look at this, as we talk about this—and I appreciate my friend from Florida, and he makes a good case for his side—I am going to simply make the case for our side that when you look at regulatory burdens that shouldn't be there, when you are looking at it, as we just talked about, where every regulatory burden does not come down to clean air and clean water. Every regulatory burden we talk about does not come down to clean water, clean air, or working on airplanes or anything else. There are some that just simply are in the way in business. Like I mentioned earlier in my talk concerning how the linchpin on a baker's can actually should work. Really, Mr. Speaker?

So in this issue, let's continue to move how we are, let's continue to put forward commonsense regulations. We can disagree, and that is why that vote total on that board will show up in just a little while. But at the end of the day, who is on your side? It is the Republican majority who says: let's get to work safely, helpful, let's make sure everybody has the opportunity to continue to do what they intended to do, but do so in a sense that makes sense and doesn't continue to be punitive.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I appreciate the passion of my friend from Georgia. I would suggest to him that I am amused that he would get in the weeds in a rather substantial legal opinion. A portion of it he correctly cited, but he omitted the continuing part of the judge's remarks that said that, indeed, you could go back and put forth a resolution.

I find it particularly amusing that my friends on the other side, after not granting that judge a hearing so that he could become a Supreme Court Justice, now want to say what a great judge he is and what a great amount of work he does. Shame on everyone who did not give him an appropriate hearing. But I understand what it is to steal a Justice of the Supreme Court, and that is what my friends on the Republican side did. This judge's opinion continued on to say that you could establish regulations.

Mr. Speaker, up until now, every President since Gerald Ford has dis-

closed his tax return information. These returns have provided a basic level of transparency that has helped to ensure the public's interest is placed first. The American people deserve the same level of disclosure from Donald John Trump. If they continue to refuse to provide it, it is incumbent upon us, as the people's elected representatives, to hold the executive branch accountable.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring Representative ANNA ESHOO's bill which would require Presidents and major party nominees for the Presidency to release their tax returns.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO), my good friend and classmate, to discuss our proposal.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), my friend, classmate, and wonderful colleague, for yielding time to me.

I rise today in opposition to the rule and the underlying bills. I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so that this bipartisan bill that I have written, the Presidential Tax Transparency Act, can be made in order for immediate floor debate and a vote.

The Presidential Tax Transparency Act would require the President and all future Presidents and Presidential nominees of the major parties, Democrats and Republicans, to publicly disclose their tax returns. It came as a surprise to many Americans, during the 2016 campaign, that this disclosure was not required by law. Instead, we have had a tradition of voluntary disclosure among every President of both parties since the post-Watergate era. Until now, our Presidents have recognized that those who seek or hold the most powerful office in the world should be held to the highest standard of transparency.

Donald Trump is the first President to refuse to release his tax returns since Gerald Ford, a man of the House. I remember when his remains were brought to the Capitol where he rested in the rotunda but came by the doors of the House. He was a man of the House and a man of integrity.

□ 1245

He along with a host of others, Democrats and Republicans, voluntarily released their tax returns. But Mr. Trump's 2016 candidate filing with the Federal Election Commission shows that he has 564 financial positions in companies located both in the

United States and around the world, including relationships with state-affiliated businesses in several countries.

Why is this important to note? The President had an opportunity to resolve these potential conflicts of interest by divesting and placing his business assets into a true blind trust, as other Presidents have done, Republicans and Democrats. Instead, he chose to turn over control of his business to his sons in an arrangement that the Director of the nonpartisan Office of Government Ethics called "wholly inadequate" and "meaningless from a conflict of interest perspective." Since he is taken office, these ethics concerns have been borne out in the form of his and his campaign's connections to Russia, deeply, deeply troubling to all of us and to the American people, legitimately so; his family's potential new business dealings in the Dominican Republic and Uruguay; and the hiring of a "director of diplomatic sales" at his Washington, D.C., hotel to attract high-priced business among foreign diplomats. This is deeply unsettling, to say the least.

Simply put, the President's business empire makes him more susceptible to conflicts of interest than any other President in the history of our country. Three of the President's nominees have already withdrawn their names from consideration due to potential financial conflicts of interest. Only a full release of the President's tax returns will provide the public with clear information as to his potential conflicts of interest and his potential entanglements with foreign governments and foreign businesses.

Last night, here on the floor, the House voted along party lines, unfortunately, to block an effort to obtain the President's tax returns under the House's existing authority. Today, we have another chance to honor the will of the American people and write this important disclosure tradition into law—into law.

According to a recent Washington Post/ABC News poll, 74 percent of Americans believe the President should release his tax returns—74 percent. The top petition on the White House website has over 1 million signatures to it, calling on the President to release his tax returns.

I think the voice of the people, the American people, is clear. As their representatives, they deserve to have us take action on this because we all want a conflict of interest-free President.

I urge my colleagues to reject the previous question so we can hold an immediate vote on the Presidential Tax Transparency Act.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As my friend from Florida just said, I think we can sum it up very easily right here on this discussion. And, no, I did not choose not to continue the other quotes in the ruling which were, again, pretty amazing. I will just say

this. The reason is because I was saving it for now.

They said: Well, you can go ahead and do a new regulation you can make them keep for 5 years. But as an Old Scripture taught me years ago: all things may be lawful, but not all things are profitable. You can do some things, but, in the end, are they really getting at the end result of what OSHA is supposed to do? Are you protecting employers and employees? Are you making the workplace safer? And right here, we are just not seeing that.

I think what is also interesting as we look at this is let's just have common sense in this. You still cannot punish up to 6 months. The court actually even said also, as well, as much the same on page 13 of their opinion.

I think what we have to look at here is, in looking at this, let's talk about the issues of common sense; let's talk about regulatory burden that works instead of regulatory burden that does not.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This evening, Donald John Trump will address a joint session of Congress. I expect we will hear some version of the same message we have heard throughout the first month of his chaotic administration—talk of jobs and American workers and protecting our country—but that is all it has been up to now, just talk. Instead of actually doing any of those things, Republicans are sowing chaos trying to turn their absurd campaign speeches into something that resembles policy; and, frankly, that just will not fly.

Donald John Trump's campaign rhetoric doesn't fit the actual challenges of governing, and I believe my friends on the other side of the aisle are starting to come to this realization. If they haven't, may I urge upon them that the rubber is going to hit the road with the debt ceiling and with tax reform and with repeal and replace of the Affordable Care Act. I ask the American public to watch the divisions on the other side when the rubber hits the road.

Mr. Speaker, with every action they take, reality and facts keep stopping them in their tracks. The un-American Muslim ban was put in check by the judicial branch. Their attempts to repeal ObamaCare have been checked by their own constituents at their own town-halls. The majority needs to wake up and realize that these are not sound policies, but reckless chaos.

It is past time for the majority to get serious about the serious business of governing. And yet, with these measures here today, all we continue to see are antiworker, antienvironment, and, in the final analysis, anti-American proposals. The American people want solutions, not a governing party that just checks the box of unrealistic, chaotic, and harmful campaign promises.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the rule and the underlying measure.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As we come to the close of this time of rule debate, I think we have laid this out. I think, again, it is very clear, Mr. Speaker, what we determine and what we go forward with in the process.

As we move forward, it is interesting to me—and I would be, too, if I were in the minority and didn't really have a plan except the one that has been tearing up the health insurance market, that has been hurting others. And now as we look to actually make movement on a replacement and repeal of that, I would say that I would watch for divisions. I would watch for cracks and the fissures. I would do whatever I could.

But the truth of the matter is that, over the next month, in this body, we are going to move forward with what we have said we are going to do. We are going to be working on those aspects. We are going to be bringing it to the floor, and the American people can make the judgment for themselves.

People will continue to discuss. It is healthy in our country to have that discussion. It is healthy that we move forward. It is also healthy we examine all of the facts.

This rule today, though, simply deals with common sense. Let's look at our regulatory burden. Let's look at issues that—again, it is one thing to look at a rule that is there for protection. Workplace safety is enhanced by making you record what is going on and making you be able to then correct what may be a problem in your business. But simply keeping records for 5 years when you can't be punished but for 6 months of those is simply putting a burden on business to keep records that are really at the end of the day not accomplishing your bottom line.

It goes back to what I said earlier, Mr. Speaker. I believe that OSHA is a valuable organization when doing what it is supposed to be doing: protecting workplace safety, doing things that actually matter, doing things that actually help. But many times in my businesses that I go to, they have put in rules over the years that say that we are now in a continuing violation.

In other words, if one time they come in and they say that an electrical outlet is not plugged in properly to an extension cord, you fix that. When they come back 2 or 3 months later and see something on the other side of the building that deals with electrical, then they will say, well, it is a continuing violation, not the violation previous, and they triple the fines.

OSHA now, and the good folks who work there, I believe, truly want to help. They truly have set out best practices. But they have grown to the point where we have allowed them to become not the help that they should be, but are basically and many times a hindrance and a menace to our businesses, from the farms to the factories, to the coal mines, all that. It has just gotten out of hand.

So my discussion, Mr. Speaker, is this. How do you get regulatory burden that actually makes sense?

We are not going to stand here and argue over a rule that makes sense. I will never sit here and say that we should not record workplace injuries and let businessowners then be fined if they are doing something wrong. We will never argue about that.

But when it comes to the point of excessive recordkeeping that, at the end of the day, does nothing except burden the business, how do you explain that as helping workplace safety? If my son is in the pool and can't get to the side and I do nothing, I can have great intentions; but unless I get in and bring him to the side, then I have actually done something.

A rule that has no end result to the bottom line of what you are doing is simply waving and saying, "Oh, I am doing something," instead of getting back to the purpose that OSHA should be about. When businesses and OSHA cannot work together collaboratively to seek and to set a process in which businesses are safer and employees are healthier, then OSHA is failing and they have become punitive in nature.

Why don't they come in and help businesses? Why don't they come in and start? And if there is a business that continues the process of being bad actors in the marketplace, then take them out, fine them, do what you need to do. But I, myself, believe that most businessowners—and I was one at one point—that we don't go in every day wanting to hurt employees. We don't want to do that. We want to have a safe workplace that presents a good product, that presents a good service, that presents the activity that continues our economic engine.

Let's quit defending rules that don't work. Let's quit wasting time defending rules and having our agencies in this city determine that all they want to do is generate rules because that is their job description. Let's see the things that actually work. If they want to be policy experts, then let them run for office. But if you are going to at least look at it, do it by the law.

Mr. Speaker, these rules before us today provide two very important bills that take steps to get our economic engine going again. They do, as we have talked about, look at unnecessary rules. They look at things that need to be examined.

But we also can't simply pretend existing nonsensical regulations don't exist, because they are being enforced at the expense of innovators and job creators across the country, and they are being enforced without using any common sense.

A case in point, did you know that trains have to have an F painted on the front of them so that people can tell which end is the front? I don't know about you, but I believe Americans can tell the front from the back of a train.

We have got to identify existing business regulations like this that are outdated and simply don't make sense

anymore and start taking steps to repeal them. The bills before us today are a step in the right direction.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying bill.

The material previously referred to by Mr. HASTINGS is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 150 OFFERED BY
MR. HASTINGS

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 3. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 305) to amend the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 to require the disclosure of certain tax returns by Presidents and certain candidates for the office of the President, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided among and controlled by the respective chairs and ranking minority members of the Committees on Ways and Means and Oversight and Government Reform. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 305.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT
IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's *Precedents of the House of Representatives* (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's *Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives*, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE
CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 28, 2017.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on February 28, 2017, at 9:20 a.m.:

Appointment:

Senate National Security Working Group
for the One Hundred Fifteenth Congress.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

APPOINTMENT OF INDIVIDUAL TO
BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE
UNITED STATES AIR FORCE
ACADEMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 9355(a), and the order of the House of January 3, 2017, of the following individual on the part of the House to the Board of Visitors to the United States Air Force Academy:

Lieutenant Colonel Bruce Swezey,
U.S. Air Force, Retired, Franklin, Wisconsin

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 1 p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1346

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky) at 1 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 150; and

Adoption of House Resolution 150, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The second electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 998, SEARCHING FOR AND CUTTING REGULATIONS THAT ARE UNNECESSARILY BURDENSOME ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 83, DISAPPROVING THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR RELATING TO "CLARIFICATION OF EMPLOYER'S CONTINUING OBLIGATION TO MAKE AND MAINTAIN AN ACCURATE RECORD OF EACH RECORDABLE INJURY AND ILLNESS"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 150) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 998) to provide for the establishment of a process

for the review of rules and sets of rules, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 83) disapproving the rule submitted by the Department of Labor relating to “Clarification of Employer’s Continuing Obligation to Make and Maintain an Accurate Record of Each Recordable Injury and Illness”, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 224, nays 191, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 103]

YEAS—224

Abraham	Garrett	Mooney (WV)
Aderholt	Gohmert	Mullin
Allen	Goodlatte	Murphy (PA)
Amash	Gowdy	Newhouse
Amodei	Granger	Noem
Arrington	Graves (GA)	Nunes
Babin	Graves (LA)	Olson
Bacon	Graves (MO)	Palazzo
Banks (IN)	Griffith	Palmer
Barletta	Grothman	Paulsen
Barr	Guthrie	Pearce
Barton	Harper	Perry
Bergman	Harris	Pittenger
Biggs	Hartzler	Poe (TX)
Bilirakis	Hensarling	Poliquin
Bishop (MI)	Herrera Beutler	Posey
Bishop (UT)	Hice, Jody B.	Ratcliffe
Black	Higgins (LA)	Reed
Blackburn	Hill	Reichert
Blum	Holding	Renacci
Bost	Hollingsworth	Rice (SC)
Brat	Huizenga	Roby
Bridenstine	Hultgren	Roe (TN)
Brooks (AL)	Hunter	Rogers (AL)
Brooks (IN)	Hurd	Rogers (KY)
Buchanan	Issa	Rohrabacher
Buck	Jenkins (KS)	Rokita
Bucshon	Jenkins (WV)	Rooney, Francis
Budd	Johnson (LA)	Rooney, Thomas J.
Burgess	Johnson (OH)	Ros-Lehtinen
Byrne	Johnson, Sam	Roskam
Calvert	Jones	Ross
Carter (GA)	Jordan	Rothfus
Carter (TX)	Joyce (OH)	Rouzer
Chabot	Katko	Royce (CA)
Chaffetz	Kelly (MS)	Russell
Cheney	Kelly (PA)	Rutherford
Coffman	King (IA)	Sanford
Cole	King (NY)	Scalise
Collins (GA)	Kinzing	Schweikert
Collins (NY)	Knight	Scott, Austin
Comer	Kustoff (TN)	Sensenbrenner
Conaway	Labrador	Sessions
Cook	LaHood	Shimkus
Costello (PA)	LaMalfa	Simpson
Cramer	Lamborn	Smith (MO)
Culberson	Lance	Smith (NJ)
Curbelo (FL)	Latta	Smucker
Davidson	Lewis (MN)	Stefanik
Davis, Rodney	LoBiondo	Stewart
Denham	Long	Stivers
Dent	Loudermilk	Taylor
DeSantis	Love	Tenney
DesJarlais	Lucas	Thompson (PA)
Diaz-Balart	Luetkemeyer	Thornberry
Donovan	MacArthur	Tiberi
Duffy	Marchant	Trott
Duncan (SC)	Marino	Turner
Duncan (TN)	Marshall	Upton
Dunn	Massie	Valadao
Emmer	Mast	Wagner
Farenthold	McCaul	Walberg
Faso	McClintock	Walden
Ferguson	McHenry	Walorski
Fitzpatrick	McKinley	Walters, Mimi
Fleischmann	McMorris	Weber (TX)
Flores	Rodgers	Webster (FL)
Fortenberry	McSally	Wenstrup
Fox	Meadows	Westerman
Franks (AZ)	Meehan	Williams
Frelinghuysen	Messer	Wilson (SC)
Gaetz	Mitchell	Wittman
Gallagher	Moolenaar	

Womack
Woodall
Yoder

Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)

NAYS—191

Adams	Gabbard	Nolan
Aguilar	Gallego	Norcross
Barragán	Garamendi	O'Halleran
Bass	Gonzalez (TX)	O'Rourke
Beatty	Gottheimer	Pallone
Bera	Green, Al	Panetta
Beyer	Green, Gene	Pascrell
Bishop (GA)	Grijalva	Payne
Blumenauer	Gutiérrez	Pelosi
Blunt Rochester	Hanabusa	Perlmutter
Bonamici	Hastings	Peters
Boyle, Brendan F.	Heck	Peterson
Brady (PA)	Higgins (NY)	Pingree
Brown (MD)	Himes	Pocan
Brownley (CA)	Hoyer	Polis
Bustos	Huffman	Price (NC)
Butterfield	Jackson Lee	Quigley
Capuano	Jayapal	Raskin
Carbajal	Jeffries	Rice (NY)
Cárdenas	Johnson (GA)	Richmond
Carson (IN)	Johnson, E. B.	Rosen
Cartwright	Kaptur	Roybal-Allard
Castor (FL)	Keating	Ruiz
Castro (TX)	Kelly (IL)	Ruppersberger
Chu, Judy	Kennedy	Ryan (OH)
Cicilline	Khanna	Sánchez
Clark (MA)	Kihuen	Sarbanes
Clarke (NY)	Kildee	Schakowsky
Clay	Kilmer	Schiff
Cleaver	Kind	Schneider
Clyburn	Krishnamoorthi	Schrader
Cohen	Kuster (NH)	Scott (VA)
Connolly	Langevin	Serrano
Conyers	Larsen (WA)	Sewell (AL)
Cooper	Larson (CT)	Shea-Porter
Correa	Lawrence	Sherman
Costa	Lawson (FL)	Sinema
Courtney	Lee	Sires
Crist	Levin	Slaughter
Crowley	Lewis (GA)	Smith (WA)
Cuellar	Lieu, Ted	Soto
Cummings	Lipinski	Speier
Davis (CA)	Loebback	Suozzi
Davis, Danny	Lofgren	Swalwell (CA)
DeFazio	Lowenthal	Takano
DeGette	Lowe	Thompson (CA)
Delaney	Lujan Grisham, M.	Thompson (MS)
DeLauro	Luján, Ben Ray	Titus
DeBene	Lynch	Tonko
Demings	Maloney	Torres
DeSaulnier	Carolyn B.	Tsongas
Deutsch	Maloney, Sean	Vargas
Dingell	Malone, Sean	Veasey
Doggett	Matsumi	Vela
Doyle, Michael F.	McCollum	Velázquez
Ellison	McEachin	Visclosky
Engel	McGovern	Walz
Eshoo	McNerney	Wasserman
Español	Meeks	Schultz
Español	Meng	Waters, Maxine
Esty	Moore	Watson Coleman
Evans	Moulton	Welch
Foster	Murphy (FL)	Wilson (FL)
Frankel (FL)	Nadler	Yarmuth
Fudge	Napolitano	
	Neal	

NOT VOTING—15

Brady (TX)
Comstock
Crawford
Gibbs
Gosar

Hudson
McCarthy
Rush
Scott, David
Shuster

Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Tipton
Walker
Zinke

□ 1411

Mr. PALLONE changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PALMER). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 225, noes 188, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 104]

AYES—225

Abraham	Gowdy	Olson
Aderholt	Granger	Palazzo
Allen	Graves (GA)	Palmer
Amash	Graves (LA)	Paulsen
Amodei	Graves (MO)	Pearce
Arrington	Griffith	Perry
Babin	Grothman	Pittenger
Bacon	Guthrie	Poe (TX)
Banks (IN)	Harper	Poliquin
Barletta	Harris	Posey
Barr	Hartzler	Ratcliffe
Barton	Hensarling	Reed
Bergman	Herrera Beutler	Reichert
Biggs	Hice, Jody B.	Renacci
Bilirakis	Higgins (LA)	Rice (SC)
Bishop (MI)	Hill	Roby
Bishop (UT)	Holding	Roe (TN)
Black	Hollingsworth	Rogers (AL)
Blackburn	Huizenga	Rogers (KY)
Blum	Hultgren	Rohrabacher
Bost	Hunter	Rokita
Brat	Hurd	Rooney, Francis
Bridenstine	Issa	Rooney, Thomas J.
Brooks (AL)	Jenkins (KS)	Ros-Lehtinen
Brooks (IN)	Jenkins (WV)	Roskam
Buchanan	Johnson (LA)	Ross
Buck	Johnson (OH)	Rothfus
Bucshon	Johnson, Sam	Rouzer
Budd	Jones	Royce (CA)
Burgess	Jordan	Russell
Byrne	Joyce (OH)	Rutherford
Calvert	Katko	Sanford
Carter (GA)	Kelly (MS)	Scalise
Carter (TX)	Kelly (PA)	Schweikert
Chabot	King (IA)	Scott, Austin
Chaffetz	King (NY)	Sensenbrenner
Cheney	Kinzing	Sessions
Coffman	Knight	Shimkus
Cole	Kustoff (TN)	Simpson
Collins (GA)	Labrador	Sinema
Collins (NY)	LaHood	Smith (MO)
Comer	LaMalfa	Smith (NJ)
Conaway	Lamborn	Smucker
Cook	Lance	Stefanik
Costello (PA)	Latta	Stewart
Cramer	Lewis (MN)	Stivers
Culberson	LoBiondo	Taylor
Curbelo (FL)	Loudermilk	Tenney
Davidson	Love	Thompson (PA)
Davis, Rodney	Lucas	Thornberry
Denham	Luetkemeyer	Tiberi
Dent	MacArthur	Trott
DeSantis	Marchant	Turner
DesJarlais	Marino	Upton
Diaz-Balart	Marshall	Valadao
Donovan	Massie	Wagner
Duffy	Mast	Walberg
Duncan (SC)	McCaul	Walden
Duncan (TN)	McClintock	Walorski
Dunn	McHenry	Walters, Mimi
Emmer	McKinley	Weber (TX)
Farenthold	McMorris	Webster (FL)
Faso	Rodgers	Wenstrup
Ferguson	McSally	Westerman
Fitzpatrick	Meadows	Williams
Fleischmann	Meehan	Wilson (SC)
Flores	Messer	Wittman
Fortenberry	Mitchell	
Fox	Moolenaar	
Franks (AZ)	Mooney (WV)	
Frelinghuysen	Gaetz	
Gaetz	Mullin	
Gallagher	Murphy (PA)	
	Newhouse	
	Noem	
	Nunes	

NOES—188

Adams	Boyle, Brendan F.	Cartwright
Aguilar		Castor (FL)
Barragán	Brady (PA)	Castro (TX)
Bass	Brown (MD)	Chu, Judy
Beatty	Brownley (CA)	Cicilline
Bera	Bustos	Clark (MA)
Beyer	Butterfield	Clarke (NY)
Bishop (GA)	Capuano	Clay
Blumenauer	Carbajal	Cleaver
Blunt Rochester	Cárdenas	Clyburn
Bonamici	Carson (IN)	Cohen

Connolly	Kaptur	Peters
Conyers	Keating	Peterson
Cooper	Kelly (IL)	Pingree
Correa	Kennedy	Pocan
Costa	Khanna	Polis
Courtney	Kihuen	Price (NC)
Crist	Kildee	Quigley
Crowley	Kilmer	Raskin
Cuellar	Kind	Rice (NY)
Cummings	Krishnamoorthi	Richmond
Davis (CA)	Kuster (NH)	Rosen
Davis, Danny	Langevin	Roybal-Allard
DeFazio	Larsen (WA)	Ruiz
DeGette	Larson (CT)	Ruppersberger
Delaney	Lawrence	Ryan (OH)
DeLauro	Lawson (FL)	Sánchez
DelBene	Lee	Sarbanes
Demings	Levin	Schakowsky
DeSaulnier	Lewis (GA)	Schiff
Deutch	Lieu, Ted	Schneider
Dingell	Lipinski	Schrader
Doggett	Loeb	Scott (VA)
Doyle, Michael	Lofgren	Scott, David
F.	Lowenthal	Serrano
Ellison	Lowe	Sewell (AL)
Engel	Lujan Grisham,	Shea-Porter
Eshoo	M.	Sherman
Espallat	Luján, Ben Ray	Sires
Esty	Lynch	Slaughter
Evans	Maloney	Soto
Foster	Carolyn B.	Speier
Frankel (FL)	Maloney, Sean	Suozzi
Fudge	Matsui	Swalwell (CA)
Gabbard	McCollum	Takano
Gallo	McEachin	Thompson (CA)
Garamendi	McGovern	Thompson (MS)
Gonzalez (TX)	McNerney	Titus
Gottheimer	Meeks	Tonko
Green, Al	Meng	Torres
Green, Gene	Moore	Tsongas
Grijalva	Moulton	Veasey
Gutiérrez	Murphy (FL)	Vela
Hanabusa	Nadler	Velázquez
Hastings	Napolitano	Visclosky
Heck	Neal	Walz
Higgins (NY)	Nolan	Wasserman
Himes	Norcross	Schultz
Hoyer	O'Halleran	Waters, Maxine
Huffman	O'Rourke	Watson Coleman
Jackson Lee	Pallone	Welch
Jayapal	Panetta	Wilson (FL)
Jeffries	Payne	Yarmuth
Johnson (GA)	Pelosi	
Johnson, E. B.	Perlmutter	

NOT VOTING—17

Brady (TX)	McCarthy	Smith (WA)
Comstock	Pascrell	Tipton
Crawford	Rush	Vargas
Gibbs	Shuster	Walker
Gosar	Smith (NE)	Zinke
Hudson	Smith (TX)	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1418

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained because I was attending a meeting at the White House. Had I been present, I would have voted "Yea" on rollcall No. 103 and "Yea" on rollcall No. 104.

SEARCHING FOR AND CUTTING REGULATIONS THAT ARE UNNECESSARILY BURDENSOME ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 998.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 150 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 998.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1421

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 998) to provide for the establishment of a process for the review of rules and sets of rules, and for other purposes, with Mr. PALMER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 998, the Searching for and Cutting Regulations that are Unnecessarily Burdensome Act, also known as the SCRUB Act, was introduced by our colleague JASON SMITH. I happen to be a cosponsor of this bill, as well as the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), the chairman of the Committee on Rules. We rise in support of this bill, the SCRUB Act.

Regulatory accumulation is a significant problem for the Federal Government. Year after year, Federal agencies add regulation after regulation, piling on to an already very complex and crowded regulatory system. The Code of Federal Regulations, also known as the CFR, has some 178,000 pages. These are the regulations that you are supposed to understand if you are in a business—small business, big business, medium-sized business. It contains more than 1 million regulatory restrictions. Every year the Federal Government adds, on average, nearly 12,000 new regulations on top of those.

The regulatory accumulation has considerable impact upon our economy. According to the Competitive Enterprise Institute, regulatory compliance hurts economic growth by pulling nearly \$1.8 trillion out of the economy. Regulations are particularly hard on small businesses that don't have the legal resources and the wherewithal to understand all of the complexities. Many small- and medium-sized businesses will be doing things that they

don't necessarily even know or understand could be problematic.

There is room for regulation, don't get me wrong. I am not suggesting there should be no regulation, but we are trying to clean up some of this regulation and weed out the good from the bad. The SCRUB Act will enable the government to do so, and that is why I appreciate our colleague JASON SMITH for championing and bringing this bill to the floor again.

The SCRUB Act establishes a bipartisan—and I can't say that enough, a bipartisan—Retrospective Regulatory Review Commission to conduct a comprehensive review of Federal regulation. The commission's goal is to reduce regulatory costs to the economy by at least 15 percent.

The act charges the commission with identifying outdated, obsolete, and unnecessary regulations in need of repeal or amendment. The commission gives priority to those regulations that are 15 years old and older. I think that is an appropriate direction that they should go.

The commission will consist of regulatory experts chosen on a bipartisan basis and confirmed by the United States Senate. They will take a governmentwide look at the regulatory system, allowing for impartial and wide-ranging review of outdated and unnecessary regulations.

This is not a new or a partisan concept. In fact, in 1978, President Jimmy Carter issued an executive order requiring agencies to "periodically review their existing regulations to determine whether they are achieving the policy goals." In addition, every President since has required some level of retrospective regulatory self-review by those agencies themselves. In fact, it was President Obama who issued three executive orders on regulatory review. He required agencies to develop retrospective review plans and to set priorities for implementing that review.

The commission is tasked with identifying regulations that ought to be repealed or amended. The commission will use commonsense criteria to determine whether regulations are overlaps, duplicates, or just flat-out conflicts with existing regulations. After expedited congressional approval, agencies are required to repeal some regulations based on the commission's recommendations. So you have people who are selected, they are Senate confirmed, then they bring forward a package that is allowed to be viewed by Congress.

Some have said, well, you know, this is excusing Congress from its duties. Quite to the contrary. The committees, Members, everybody should be paying attention to this, but to have a bipartisan group go out and look and make a recommendation, then it is up to Congress whether or not to accept it. We need to go through the House, the Senate, and be signed on by the President in a bipartisan way because there

will be Members from both sides of the aisle who will be able to appoint members.

Other regulations would be subject to innovative, regulatory CutGo procedures. The CutGo process gives agencies flexibility on how to prioritize regulatory elimination. It allows agencies to choose which regulations to repeal or amend and at what time. However, new regulations may not be promulgated until equally costly regulations are repealed.

The SCRUB Act gives agencies the direction and momentum needed to implement the regulatory reform our economy needs. We all know that regulations can improve health and safety; but sometimes, with the best intention, these outdated and excessive regulations hurt our economy and put other people in jeopardy. The accumulation over decades is something that should just simply be reviewed. I think it is pretty hard to argue that a review process is unwarranted or unneeded, given the amazing and impactful status that it puts upon those things that are damaging our economy.

I again want to thank JASON SMITH for his leadership on this issue. I also want to thank Chairman BOB GOODLATTE and the Judiciary staff for their dedicated work on this, as well as Chairman PETE SESSIONS for his good work on this. A lot of good people have worked on this. I do support it.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM,

Washington, DC, February 16, 2017.

Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On February 14, 2017, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform ordered reported without amendment H.R. 998, the "Searching for and Cutting Regulations that are Unnecessarily Burdensome Act of 2017" (SCRUB Act) by a vote of 22 to 17. The bill was referred primarily to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, with an additional referral to the Committee on the Judiciary.

I ask that you allow the Committee on the Judiciary to be discharged from further consideration of the bill so that it may be scheduled by the Majority Leader. This discharge in no way affects your jurisdiction over the subject matter of the bill, and it will not serve as precedent for future referrals. In addition, should a conference on the bill be necessary, I would support your request to have the Committee on the Judiciary represented on the conference committee. Finally, I would be pleased to include this letter and any response in the bill report filed by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, as well as in the *Congressional Record* during floor consideration, to memorialize our understanding.

Thank you for your consideration of my request.

Sincerely,

JASON CHAFFETZ,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, February 21, 2017.

Hon. JASON CHAFFETZ,
Chairman, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN CHAFFETZ: I write with respect to H.R. 998, the "Searching for and Cutting Regulations that are Unnecessarily Burdensome Act." As a result of your having consulted with us on provisions within H.R. 998 that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary, I forego any further consideration of this bill so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor for consideration.

The Judiciary Committee takes this action with our mutual understanding that by foregoing consideration of H.R. 998 at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over subject matter contained in this or similar legislation and that our committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as this bill or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues in our jurisdiction. Our committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation and asks that you support any such request.

I would appreciate a response to this letter confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 998 and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the *Congressional Record* during floor consideration of H.R. 998.

Sincerely,

BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this legislation. The SCRUB Act would establish a \$30 million commission of unelected—and I emphasize that, unelected—bureaucrats to duplicate work that agencies are already supposed to be doing. The bill would focus on the costs of regulations while disregarding their benefits and protecting the most vulnerable populations in our country, like the children in Flint, Michigan.

□ 1430

If there is any doubt about this, one need look no further than the so-called CutGo provision in this bill. That provision would require that, when an agency makes a new rule, it must offset the cost of that new rule for the repeal of an existing rule. This applies even if the new rule is in response to an imminent health or safety threat.

Agency compliance with this CutGo provision would also be subject to judicial review, which prolongs the process even more. This would inevitably result in lengthy delays, as both industry and nonprofit groups routinely file challenges to agency decisions.

President Obama has already issued two executive orders to eliminate unnecessary regulations. On January 18, 2011, he issued Executive Order 13563, requiring each agency to implement plans for reviewing existing rules. That executive order requires each agency to: "periodically review its existing significant regulations to determine

whether any such regulations should be modified, streamlined, expanded, or repealed."

In addition, President Obama issued Executive Order No. 13610 on May 10, 2012, requiring agencies to report twice a year to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs on the status of their review efforts. In November 2014, a report prepared for the Administrative Conference of the United States highlighted the impact of these mandated reviews, concluding: "Implementing President Obama's executive orders on retrospective review of regulations, agencies identified tens of billions of dollars of cost savings and tens of millions of hours of reduced paperwork and reporting requirements through modifications of existing regulations."

Congress has the authority and certainly the responsibility to conduct oversight to review existing agency rules and to recommend or mandate reforms, yet this bill would create a new commission, a new commission that would cost taxpayers \$30 million to do what agencies and Congress are already supposed to be doing.

In addition, the commission's report to Congress on the rules it recommends repealing would be subject to an up-or-down vote by the Congress. Congress would not be allowed to vote on each regulation individually, and this would usurp the authority of Congress.

One of the most troubling aspects of this bill is that it would entrust this unelected commission with extraordinary and virtually unlimited authority to subpoena witnesses or documents. Section 101(c) of the bill states: "The commission may issue subpoenas requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of any evidence relating to the duties of the commission. The attendance of witnesses and the production of evidence may be required from any place within the United States at any designated place of hearing within the United States."

Most agency inspectors general do not have such broad authority to compel witness testimony. Yet this unelected commission would have this authority. This means that it could compel an individual to testify on any subject. For example, a schoolteacher could be compelled to testify about education rules or a senior citizen could be compelled to testify about Medicare or Social Security rules. This extraordinary subpoena power is especially troubling because the commission's jurisdiction is limitless.

There is no restriction on what regulations the commission can review. Three prominent law professors with the Center for Progressive Reform sent a letter opposing an identical bill in the last Congress. The letter said this proposal would: "create a convoluted,

complex, and potentially very expensive new bureaucracy to review existing agency rules and make recommendations for the repeal or weakening of those rules with little meaningful oversight, transparency, or public accountability to ensure that these recommendations do not subvert the public interest."

In addition, Citizens for Sensible Safeguards, a coalition of more than 150 consumer, labor, and good-government groups, also oppose the bill.

This bill could have dangerous consequences for the health and safety of the American public; therefore, I strongly urge every Member to oppose it.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROSS).

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for allowing me this opportunity.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS).

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, America is home to some of the most creative, innovative, inspirational people imaginable. When empowered, Americans design and build in ways that change the world, and change it for the better.

But far too often, our innovators are bogged down by red tape, thanks to a government that thinks it knows better how to think, how to believe, how to run their businesses, and how to live their lives. It is not only making life more difficult. It costs us nearly \$2 trillion a year. That is about \$15,000 a family. So we are rolling back these regulations and offering much-needed relief to families and businesses across the country.

Thanks to my good friend, Representative JASON SMITH's leadership, the SCRUB Act provides another powerful tool that gives control back to the American people through their Representatives. This bill creates a long, overdue process to identify ineffective, outdated, and duplicative regulations for repeal, with priority being given to the older, major, more expensive rules.

We made a promise to the American people. Their voice matters in our government. We are going to do whatever we can to restore that voice and put it at the center of every decision we make.

I am proud of Representative SMITH's work to rein in government. I am proud to support this bill, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN), a very distinguished member of our committee.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member.

Mr. Chairman, there are many troubling aspects of this bill, but most pressing is that this legislation, without clear policy rationale, caters to demands of my Republican colleagues to slash existing regulations and muddy the process of passing new ones.

Congress already has a responsibility of reviewing existing rules and mandating reform. Why delegate that to those not elected to do so?

This unsettling bill spends millions of taxpayer dollars to create a hand-picked commission to do the job of Congress without accountability. No, thank you.

This unelected and unaccountable commission, appointed by the President and Congress, would submit regulatory changes without the opportunity to amend the measure, taking regulatory review out of the hands of the agency experts. This is counterproductive and an insult to the democratic process.

To add insult to injury, this bill makes the regulatory process transactional.

By forcing agencies to repeal regulations in order to adopt a new one, we risk public health and safety.

Why have they prioritized costs over benefit? Why are American lives on the chopping block?

I urge my colleagues to vote no against this bill.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, on January 20, America witnessed the end of the most regulation-happy Presidency in American history. Under the Obama administration, the pages of the Code of Federal Regulations reached the highest level in the history of our country.

The Obama administration issued 3,037 finalized regulations, which means almost two new regulations were added each and every day on American farmers, families, and small-business owners. Regulations from the last administration alone cost taxpayers \$873 billion. That is a burden of over \$12 million an hour added by the Obama White House on the American taxpayer. Back home in Missouri alone, the cost of complying with regulations just added by the Obama administration totaled \$19 billion, which is equal to over \$9,000 in costs per person. Regulations written by unelected bureaucrats in Washington are suffocating the very farmers and small-business owners who we need to hire and expand in order to get full workforce participation.

Today, we are considering a solution to this problem with the Searching for and Cutting Regulations that are Unnecessarily Burdensome Act, otherwise known as the SCRUB Act. The SCRUB Act's objective is to reduce the overall cost of regulations by at least 15 percent.

With the passage of the SCRUB Act today, we are simply putting the tools

in place to support what President Trump has already started. During his first full week in office, President Trump authored an executive order for the purpose of reducing regulation and controlling regulatory costs. The order is simple. For every new proposed regulation, two existing ones must be taken off the books. This order will help prioritize regulations truly in the best interest of the American people and remove ones that are outdated, burdensome, and costly.

And just last week, the President began a regulatory review task force to review existing regulations. The SCRUB Act mirrors and supports the President's actions, ensuring that our regulatory burdens never again reach the heights that they are today.

The SCRUB Act makes sure that farmers, small-business owners, and families impacted by Washington regulators have a seat at the table in prioritizing which ones the Trump White House should remove. We must help the President put an end to the Washington-knows-best mentality that has polluted our Nation's Capital and plagued the American people for the past 8 years.

Many of you voted in favor of this legislation last Congress. However, with this new administration, the American people are calling for us to change the way things are done in Washington. So it is my hope that you will join me once again in helping put an end to the Washington regulatory machine.

I also call on my colleagues on the other side of the Capitol, who seem lately more bent on obstruction, to re-evaluate why their districts and States sent them to Washington. I am hopeful they will consider supporting the legislation, policies, laws, and nominations that will help alleviate the burden of an oversized Federal Government. With the SCRUB Act, we have a real opportunity to shrink the size of government and get Washington off the backs of the American people.

I want to thank Chairman CHAFFETZ and Chairman GOODLATTE for bringing this bill up today, and I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the SCRUB Act.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER).

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, a great leader in our Congress, and someone who I admire greatly.

The only thing clever about this bill is the title. Everything else about this bill is truly diabolical. The SCRUB Act isn't going to clean anything up. Its toxic suds will just make people sicker, our environment dirtier, and our products more dangerous.

Creating an unelected commission to oversee the entire regulatory policy of the United States is undemocratic and unimaginably damaging. Essentially, five people appointed by the President

would be able to sacrifice the health and safety of the American public to the altar of big business.

□ 1445

Say good-bye to protections from big banks, big polluters, and big pharmaceutical companies; and hello to financial ruin, environmental destruction, and unsafe food and drugs.

These Presidential pawns would also have unlimited subpoena power. Now, think about this: they are going to have more subpoena power than the inspectors general in this country.

Also, the SCRUB Act's senseless and dangerous regulatory cut-go process would force agencies to choose between maintaining existing protections and responding to new threats to our health and safety. For example, in order to clean up the air, an agency might have to allow a corporation to pollute our drinking water.

Talk about death panels—this, my friends, is a death panel. The only thing the SCRUB Act washes away is commonsense governance. This is a diabolical bill; and this, my friends, is what being drunk with power delivers.

Mr. ROSS. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD).

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Madam Chair, you know what? We have got over 1 million pages of regulations. We have got so many laws nobody could possibly know them. I would venture to say there are very few people today who can't go a day without violating some law or some regulation. It has gotten too complex.

Nobody wants a dirty environment. Nobody wants dirty water, but we need a reasonable amount of regulation that we can understand, that we can follow, and that will protect America and create jobs.

The SCRUB Act creates a commission that comes back to Congress with recommendations of what to get rid of. You know what? I would like to do it all here in Congress, too, but we sure face a lot of obstruction in getting things done here. It doesn't move fast here.

Let's get a commission to do the basic work. Let's bring it back to Congress, and let us decide and let us get rid of regulations. Let's make the agencies pick and choose which regulations that they think are important, and they will do it.

This is commonsense legislation to get the regulatory state under control, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The SCRUB Act poses real and significant dangers to the health and welfare of the American public. By focusing predominantly on the cost of the rules, the SCRUB Act's CutGo provision will repeal rules with little regard for how they benefit and protect the American people.

The commission's virtually unlimited authority to subpoena witnesses or

documents, combined with its uncircumscribed ability to review and recommend repeal of any current rules, is an extraordinary grant of power that could have tragic repercussions for the health and safety of the American people.

The SCRUB Act is a waste of \$30 million of hard-earned taxpayer money for work that is already being done by Federal agencies.

I strongly urge every Member to oppose this act.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROSS. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

You know, some time ago, when I first got involved in this political processing, I made it known that I felt that the silent killer of American business was the regulatory regime that we have in place, where over 50 years this Congress has ceded its authority to unelectable, unaccountable bureaucrats. Today we have 175,000 pages in the Code of Federal Register that is evidence of that. It is time that we, as a Congress, on behalf of our constituency, on behalf of the future well-being of this country, take back that authority with oversight and accountability through this SCRUB Act.

It has been said that there is approximately, on average, \$20,000 a year per employee of a manufacturer that is attributable just to compliance with regulation. We need to make sure that we have our manufacturers, our businesses, doing that which they do best within a reasonable regulatory scheme, and that is what this act offers: a reasonable regulatory scheme that allows Congress who has the authority—actually has the only authority—to hold accountable these unelectable bureaucrats. The SCRUB Act will allow us to do that.

It will allow due process through a discovery process. More importantly, the review board, the commission, the five bipartisan members who are appointed by the President must be confirmed by the Senate. This, in and of itself, is a sense of due process, a sense of accountability, and, more importantly, a strong sense of purpose that the American people would want to see this Congress be able to go in and take back the authority that they have delegated—at sometimes recklessly—to these bureaucratic organizations.

We talk about the \$30 million. I know the \$30 million is always big in any equation that you have, but when you allow the \$30 million to be spent over 5 years and you allow that to have the removal of certain regulations, you will pay for this \$30 million 10 times over in no time at all.

So it is with a sense of advocacy on behalf of not only congressional authority, but also a sense of advocacy on behalf of American business and the future economic growth of this country, that I ask my colleagues to wholeheartedly support the SCRUB Act.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to H.R. 998, the SCRUB Act.

This ill-advised bill would require agencies to undertake a regulatory cut-go process to repeal rules identified by the Commission, with little to no consideration of the benefits, prior to issuing any new rule.

The SCRUB Act's regulatory cut-go procedures are unsafe, dangerous, and would tie the hands of agencies responding to public health crises requiring timely regulatory responses. In fact, this bill lacks any mechanism for consideration of public health and safety, thus leaving no option for agencies to issue emergency rules to protect the public and environment from imminent harm.

The bill's proponents may claim that the title I of the H.R. 1155 would allow the Commission to consider whether the costs of the bill are not justified by the benefit to society. But as witnesses testified during the Judiciary Committee's consideration of a previous version of this bill, the catch-all language of subsection (h)(2)(I) would allow the Commission to completely disregard any benefit of regulation.

In both Republican and Democratic administrations, the benefits of our system of regulatory protections have made our country safer, stronger, healthier, and cleaner. While consideration of the costs of regulations is important, there is overwhelming consensus that the benefits of regulation vastly exceed the costs.

The Government Accountability Office has observed that these benefits "include, among other things, ensuring that workplaces, air travel, foods, and drugs are safe; that the nation's air, water and land are not polluted; and that the appropriate amount of taxes is collected."

This evidence overwhelmingly refutes the assertion that regulatory costs are burdensome, eliminate jobs, or harm our economic competitiveness. We should be empowering our agencies, not hindering them, to take the steps needed to protect our environment, consumer products, public health, and safety.

I ask my colleagues to oppose this bill.

The Acting CHAIR (Ms. FOXX). All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 998

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Searching for and Cutting Regulations that are Unnecessarily Burdensome Act" or as the "SCRUB Act".

SEC. 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Sec. 1. Short title.

Sec. 2. Table of contents.

TITLE I—RETROSPECTIVE REGULATORY REVIEW COMMISSION

Sec. 101. In general.

TITLE II—REGULATORY CUT-GO

Sec. 201. Cut-go procedures.

Sec. 202. Applicability.

Sec. 203. OIRA certification of cost calculations.

TITLE III—RETROSPECTIVE REVIEW OF NEW RULES

Sec. 301. Plan for future review.

TITLE IV—JUDICIAL REVIEW

Sec. 401. Judicial review.

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Sec. 501. Definitions.

Sec. 502. Effective date.

TITLE I—RETROSPECTIVE REGULATORY REVIEW COMMISSION**SEC. 101. IN GENERAL.**

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—There is established a commission, to be known as the “Retrospective Regulatory Review Commission”, that shall review rules and sets of rules in accordance with specified criteria to determine if a rule or set of rules should be repealed to eliminate or reduce the costs of regulation to the economy. The Commission shall terminate on the date that is 5 years and 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act or 5 years after the date by which all Commission members’ terms have commenced, whichever is later.

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—

(1) **NUMBER.**—The Commission shall be composed of 9 members who shall be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. Each member shall be appointed not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) **TERM.**—The term of each member shall commence upon the member’s confirmation by the Senate and shall extend to the date that is 5 years and 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act or that is 5 years after the date by which all members have been confirmed by the Senate, whichever is later.

(3) **APPOINTMENT.**—The members of the Commission shall be appointed as follows:

(A) **CHAIR.**—The President shall appoint as the Chair of the Commission an individual with expertise and experience in rulemaking, such as past Administrators of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, past chairmen of the Administrative Conference of the United States, and other individuals with similar expertise and experience in rulemaking affairs and the administration of regulatory reviews.

(B) **CANDIDATE LIST OF MEMBERS.**—The Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Minority Leader of the House of Representatives, the Majority Leader of the Senate, and the Minority Leader of the Senate shall each present to the President a list of candidates to be members of the Commission. Such candidates shall be individuals learned in rulemaking affairs and, preferably, administration of regulatory reviews. The President shall appoint 2 members of the Commission from each list provided under this subparagraph, subject to the provisions of subparagraph (C).

(C) **RESUBMISSION OF CANDIDATE.**—The President may request from the presenter of the list under subparagraph (B) a new list of one or more candidates if the President—

(i) determines that any candidate on the list presented pursuant to subparagraph (B) does not meet the qualifications specified in such subparagraph to be a member of the Commission; and

(ii) certifies that determination to the congressional officials specified in subparagraph (B).

(c) POWERS AND AUTHORITIES OF THE COMMISSION.—

(1) **MEETINGS.**—The Commission may meet when, where, and as often as the Commission determines appropriate, except that the Commission shall hold public meetings not less than twice each year. All meetings of the Commission shall be open to the public.

(2) **HEARINGS.**—In addition to meetings held under paragraph (1), the Commission may hold hearings to consider issues of fact or law relevant to the Commission’s work. Any hearing held by the Commission shall be open to the public.

(3) **ACCESS TO INFORMATION.**—The Commission may secure directly from any agency information and documents necessary to enable the Commission to carry out this Act. Upon request of the Chair of the Commission, the head of that agency shall furnish that information or document to the Commission as soon as possible, but not later than two weeks after the date on which the request was made.

(4) SUBPOENAS.—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Commission may issue subpoenas requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of any evidence relating to the duties of the Commission. The attendance of witnesses and the production of evidence may be required from any place within the United States at any designated place of hearing within the United States.

(B) **FAILURE TO OBEY A SUBPOENA.**—If a person refuses to obey a subpoena issued under subparagraph (A), the Commission may apply to a United States district court for an order requiring that person to appear before the Commission to give testimony, produce evidence, or both, relating to the matter under investigation. The application may be made within the judicial district where the hearing is conducted or where that person is found, resides, or transacts business. Any failure to obey the order of the court may be punished by the court as civil contempt.

(C) **SERVICE OF SUBPOENAS.**—The subpoenas of the Commission shall be served in the manner provided for subpoenas issued by a United States district court under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure for the United States district courts.

(D) **SERVICE OF PROCESS.**—All process of any court to which application is made under subparagraph (B) may be served in the judicial district in which the person required to be served resides or may be found.

(d) PAY AND TRAVEL EXPENSES.—**(1) PAY.**—

(A) **MEMBERS.**—Each member, other than the Chair of the Commission, shall be paid at a rate equal to the daily equivalent of the minimum annual rate of basic pay payable for level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code, for each day (including travel time) during which the member is engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Commission.

(B) **CHAIR.**—The Chair shall be paid for each day referred to in subparagraph (A) at a rate equal to the daily equivalent of the minimum annual rate of basic pay payable for level III of the Executive Schedule under section 5314 of title 5, United States Code.

(2) **TRAVEL EXPENSES.**—Members shall receive travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in accordance with sections 5702 and 5703 of title 5, United States Code.

(e) DIRECTOR OF STAFF.—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Commission shall appoint a Director.

(2) **PAY.**—The Director shall be paid at the rate of basic pay payable for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of title 5, United States Code.

(f) STAFF.—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to paragraph (2), the Director, with the approval of the Commission, may appoint, fix the pay of, and terminate additional personnel.

(2) **LIMITATIONS ON APPOINTMENT.**—The Director may make such appointments without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and any personnel so appointed may be paid without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of that title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates, except

that an individual so appointed may not receive pay in excess of the annual rate of basic pay payable for GS-15 of the General Schedule.

(3) **AGENCY ASSISTANCE.**—Following consultation with and upon request of the Chair of the Commission, the head of any agency may detail any of the personnel of that agency to the Commission to assist the Commission in carrying out the duties of the Commission under this Act.

(4) **GAO AND OIRA ASSISTANCE.**—The Comptroller General of the United States and the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs shall provide assistance, including the detailing of employees, to the Commission in accordance with an agreement entered into with the Commission.

(5) **ASSISTANCE FROM OTHER PARTIES.**—Congress, the States, municipalities, federally recognized Indian tribes, and local governments may provide assistance, including the detailing of employees, to the Commission in accordance with an agreement entered into with the Commission.

(g) OTHER AUTHORITY.—

(1) **EXPERTS AND CONSULTANTS.**—The Commission may procure by contract, to the extent funds are available, the temporary or intermittent services of experts or consultants pursuant to section 3109 of title 5, United States Code.

(2) **PROPERTY.**—The Commission may lease space and acquire personal property to the extent funds are available.

(h) DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION.—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Commission shall conduct a review of the Code of Federal Regulations to identify rules and sets of rules that collectively implement a regulatory program that should be repealed to lower the cost of regulation to the economy. The Commission shall give priority in the review to rules or sets of rules that are major rules or include major rules, have been in effect more than 15 years, impose paperwork burdens or unfunded mandates that could be reduced substantially without significantly diminishing regulatory effectiveness, impose disproportionately high costs on entities that qualify as small entities within the meaning of section 601(6) of title 5, United States Code, or could be strengthened in their effectiveness while reducing regulatory costs. The Commission shall have as a goal of the Commission to achieve a reduction of at least 15 percent in the cumulative costs of Federal regulation with a minimal reduction in the overall effectiveness of such regulation.

(2) **NATURE OF REVIEW.**—To identify which rules and sets of rules should be repealed to lower the cost of regulation to the economy, the Commission shall apply the following criteria:

(A) Whether the original purpose of the rule or set of rules was achieved, and the rule or set of rules could be repealed without significant recurrence of adverse effects or conduct that the rule or set of rules was intended to prevent or reduce.

(B) Whether the implementation, compliance, administration, enforcement, imposition of unfunded mandates, or other costs of the rule or set of rules to the economy are not justified by the benefits to society within the United States produced by the expenditure of those costs.

(C) Whether the rule or set of rules has been rendered unnecessary or obsolete, taking into consideration the length of time since the rule was made and the degree to which technology, economic conditions, market practices, or other relevant factors have changed in the subject area affected by the rule or set of rules.

(D) Whether the rule or set of rules is ineffective at achieving the purposes of the rule or set of rules.

(E) Whether the rule or set of rules overlaps, duplicates, or conflicts with other Federal rules, and to the extent feasible, with State and local governmental rules.

(F) Whether the rule or set of rules has excessive compliance costs, imposes unfunded mandates, or is otherwise excessively burdensome, as compared to alternatives that—

(i) specify performance objectives rather than conduct or manners of compliance;

(ii) establish economic incentives to encourage desired behavior;

(iii) provide information upon which choices can be made by the public;

(iv) incorporate other innovative alternatives rather than agency actions that specify conduct or manners of compliance; or

(v) could in other ways substantially lower costs without significantly undermining effectiveness.

(G) Whether the rule or set of rules inhibits innovation in or growth of the United States economy, such as by impeding the introduction or use of safer or equally safe technology that is newer or more efficient than technology required by or permissible under the rule or set of rules.

(H) Whether or not the rule or set of rules harms competition within the United States economy or the international economic competitiveness of enterprises or entities based in the United States.

(I) Whether or not the rule or set of rules limits or prevents an agency from applying new or emerging technologies to improve efficiency and effectiveness of government.

(J) Whether the rule or set of rules harms wage growth, including wage growth for minimum wage and part-time workers.

(K) Such other criteria as the Commission devises to identify rules and sets of rules that can be repealed to eliminate or reduce unnecessarily burdensome costs to the United States economy.

(3) **METHODOLOGY FOR REVIEW.**—The Commission shall establish a methodology for conducting the review (including an overall review and discrete reviews of portions of the Code of Federal Regulations), identifying rules and sets of rules, and classifying rules under this subsection and publish the terms of the methodology in the Federal Register and on the website of the Commission. The Commission may propose and seek public comment on the methodology before the methodology is established.

(4) **CLASSIFICATION OF RULES AND SETS OF RULES.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—After completion of any review of rules or sets of rules under paragraph (2), the Commission shall classify each rule or set of rules identified in the review to qualify for recommended repeal as either a rule or set of rules—

(i) on which immediate action to repeal is recommended; or

(ii) that should be eligible for repeal under regulatory cut-go procedures under title II.

(B) **DECISIONS BY MAJORITY.**—Each decision by the Commission to identify a rule or set of rules for classification under this paragraph, and each decision whether to classify the rule or set of rules under clause (i) or (ii) of subparagraph (A), shall be made by a simple majority vote of the Commission. No such vote shall take place until after all members of the Commission have been confirmed by the Senate.

(5) **INITIATION OF REVIEW BY OTHER PERSONS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Commission may also conduct a review under paragraph (2) of, and, if appropriate, classify under paragraph (4), any rule or set of rules that is submitted for review to the Commission by—

(i) the President;

(ii) a Member of Congress;

(iii) any officer or employee of a Federal, State, local or tribal government, or regional governmental body; or

(iv) any member of the public.

(B) **FORM OF SUBMISSION.**—A submission to the Commission under this paragraph shall—

(i) identify the specific rule or set of rules submitted for review;

(ii) provide a statement of evidence to demonstrate that the rule or set of rules qualifies to be identified for repeal under the criteria listed in paragraph (2); and

(iii) such other information as the submitter believes may be helpful to the Commission's review, including a statement of the submitter's interest in the matter.

(C) **PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.**—The Commission shall make each submission received under this paragraph available on the website of the Commission as soon as possible, but not later than 1 week after the date on which the submission was received.

(i) **NOTICES AND REPORTS OF THE COMMISSION.**—

(1) **NOTICES OF AND REPORTS ON ACTIVITIES.**—The Commission shall publish, in the Federal Register and on the website of the Commission—

(A) notices in advance of all public meetings, hearings, and classifications under subsection (h) informing the public of the basis, purpose, and procedures for the meeting, hearing, or classification; and

(B) reports after the conclusion of any public meeting, hearing, or classification under subsection (h) summarizing in detail the basis, purpose, and substance of the meeting, hearing, or classification.

(2) **ANNUAL REPORTS TO CONGRESS.**—Each year, beginning on the date that is one year after the date on which all Commission members have been confirmed by the Senate, the Commission shall submit a report simultaneously to each House of Congress detailing the activities of the Commission for the previous year, and listing all rules and sets of rules classified under subsection (h) during that year. For each rule or set of rules so listed, the Commission shall—

(A) identify the agency that made the rule or set of rules;

(B) identify the annual cost of the rule or set of rules to the United States economy and the basis upon which the Commission identified that cost;

(C) identify whether the rule or set of rules was classified under clause (i) or clause (ii) of subsection (h)(4)(A);

(D) identify the criteria under subsection (h)(2) that caused the classification of the rule or set of rules and the basis upon which the Commission determined that those criteria were met;

(E) for each rule or set of rules listed under the criteria set forth in subparagraph (B), (D), (F), (G), (H), or (I) of subsection (h)(2), or other criteria established by the Commission under subparagraph (I) of such subsection under which the Commission evaluated alternatives to the rule or set of rules that could lead to lower regulatory costs, identify alternatives to the rule or set of rules that the Commission recommends the agency consider as replacements for the rule or set of rules and the basis on which the Commission rests the recommendations, and, in identifying such alternatives, emphasize alternatives that will achieve regulatory effectiveness at the lowest cost and with the lowest adverse impacts on jobs;

(F) for each rule or set of rules listed under the criteria set forth in subsection (h)(2)(E), the other Federal, State, or local governmental rules that the Commission found the rule or set of rules to overlap, duplicate, or

conflict with, and the basis for the findings of the Commission; and

(G) in the case of each set of rules so listed, analyze whether Congress should also consider repeal of the statutory authority implemented by the set of rules.

(3) **FINAL REPORT.**—Not later than the date on which the Commission members' appointments expire, the Commission shall submit a final report simultaneously to each House of Congress summarizing all activities and recommendations of the Commission, including a list of all rules or sets of rules the Commission classified under clause (i) of subsection (h)(4)(A) for immediate action to repeal, a separate list of all rules or sets of rules the Commission classified under clause (ii) of subsection (h)(4)(A) for repeal, and with regard to each rule or set of rules listed on either list, the information described in subparagraphs (A) through (F) of subsection (h)(2). This report may be included in the final annual report of the Commission under paragraph (2) and may include the Commission's recommendation whether the Commission should be reauthorized by Congress.

(j) **REPEAL OF REGULATIONS; CONGRESSIONAL CONSIDERATION OF COMMISSION REPORTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to paragraph (2)—

(A) the head of each agency with authority to repeal a rule or set of rules classified by the Commission under subsection (h)(4)(A)(i) for immediate action to repeal and newly listed as such in an annual or final report of the Commission under paragraph (2) or (3) of subsection (i) shall repeal the rule or set of rules as recommended by the Commission within 60 days after the enactment of a joint resolution under paragraph (2) for approval of the recommendations of the Commission in the report; and

(B) the head of each agency with authority to repeal a rule or set of rules classified by the Commission under subsection (h)(4)(A)(ii) for repeal and newly listed as such in an annual or final report of the Commission under paragraph (2) or (3) of subsection (i) shall repeal the rule or set of rules as recommended by the Commission pursuant to section 201, following the enactment of a joint resolution under paragraph (2) for approval of the recommendations of the Commission in the report.

(2) **CONGRESSIONAL APPROVAL.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—No head of an agency described in paragraph (1) shall be required by this Act to carry out a repeal listed by the Commission in a report transmitted to Congress under paragraph (2) or (3) of subsection (i) until a joint resolution is enacted, in accordance with the provisions of subparagraph (B), approving such recommendations of the Commission for repeal.

(B) **TERMS OF THE RESOLUTION.**—For purposes of paragraph (A), the term "joint resolution" means only a joint resolution which is introduced after the date on which the Commission transmits to the Congress under paragraph (2) or (3) of subsection (i) the report containing the recommendations to which the resolution pertains, and—

(i) which does not have a preamble;

(ii) the matter after the resolving clause of which is only as follows: "That Congress approves the recommendations for repeal of the Retrospective Regulatory Review Commission as submitted by the Commission on _____", the blank space being filled in with the appropriate date; and

(iii) the title of which is as follows: "Approving recommendations for repeal of the Retrospective Regulatory Review Commission.".

(3) **REISSUANCE OF RULES.**—

(A) **NO SUBSTANTIALLY SIMILAR RULE TO BE REISSUED.**—A rule that is repealed under

paragraph (1) or section 201 may not be re-issued in substantially the same form, and a new rule that is substantially the same as such a rule may not be issued, unless the re-issued or new rule is specifically authorized by a law enacted after the date of the joint resolution approving the Commission's recommendation to repeal the original rule.

(B) AGENCY TO ENSURE AVOIDANCE OF SIMILAR DEFECTS.—An agency, in making any new rule to implement statutory authority previously implemented by a rule repealed under paragraph (1) or section 201, shall ensure that the new rule does not result in the same adverse effects of the repealed rule that caused the Commission to recommend to Congress the latter's repeal and will not result in new adverse effects of the kind described in the criteria specified in or under subsection (h).

(k) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to the Commission to carry out this Act, not to exceed \$30,000,000.

(2) AVAILABILITY.—Any sums appropriated under the authorization contained in this section shall remain available, without fiscal year limitation, until the earlier of the date that such sums are expended or the date of the termination of the Commission.

(1) WEBSITE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall establish a public website that—

(A) uses current information technology to make records available on the website;

(B) provides information in a standard data format; and

(C) receives and publishes public comments.

(2) PUBLISHING OF INFORMATION.—Any information required to be made available on the website established pursuant to this Act shall be published in a timely manner and shall be accessible by the public on the website at no cost.

(3) RECORD OF PUBLIC MEETINGS AND HEARINGS.—All records of public meetings and hearings shall be published on the website as soon as possible, but not later than 1 week after the date on which such public meeting or hearing occurred.

(4) PUBLIC COMMENTS.—The Commission shall publish on the website all public comments and submissions.

(5) NOTICES.—The Commission shall publish on the website notices of all public meetings and hearings at least one week before the date on which such public meeting or hearing occurs.

(m) APPLICABILITY OF THE FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this Act, the Commission shall be subject to the provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.).

(2) ADVISORY COMMITTEE MANAGEMENT OFFICER.—The Commission shall not be subject to the control of any Advisory Committee Management Officer designated under section 8(b)(1) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.).

(3) SUBCOMMITTEE.—Any subcommittee of the Commission shall be treated as the Commission for purposes of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.).

(4) CHARTER.—The enactment of the SCRUB Act shall be considered to meet the requirements of the Commission under section 9(c) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.).

(n) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term “unfunded mandate” has the meaning given the term “Federal mandate” in section 421(6) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 658(6)).

TITLE II—REGULATORY CUT-GO

SEC. 201. CUT-GO PROCEDURES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in section 101(j)(2)(A) or section 202, an agency, when the agency makes a new rule, shall repeal rules or sets of rules of that agency classified by the Commission under section 101(h)(4)(A)(ii), such that the annual costs of the new rule to the United States economy is offset by such repeals, in an amount equal to or greater than the cost of the new rule, based on the regulatory cost reductions of repeal identified by the Commission.

(b) ALTERNATIVE PROCEDURE.—An agency may, alternatively, repeal rules or sets of rules of that agency classified by the Commission under section 101(h)(4)(A)(ii) prior to the time specified in subsection (a). If the agency so repeals such a rule or set of rules and thereby reduces the annual, inflation-adjusted cost of the rule or set of rules to the United States economy, the agency may thereafter apply the reduction in regulatory costs, based on the regulatory cost reductions of repeal identified by the Commission, to meet, in whole or in part, the regulatory cost reduction required under subsection (a) of this section to be made at the time the agency promulgates a new rule.

(c) ACHIEVEMENT OF FULL NET COST REDUCTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the provisions of paragraph (2), an agency may offset the costs of a new rule or set of rules by repealing a rule or set of rules listed by the Commission under section 101(h)(4)(A)(ii) that implement the same statutory authority as the new rule or set of rules.

(2) LIMITATION.—When using the authority provided in paragraph (1), the agency must achieve a net reduction in costs imposed by the agency's body of rules (including the new rule or set of rules) that is equal to or greater than the cost of the new rule or set of rules to be promulgated, including, whenever necessary, by repealing additional rules of the agency listed by the Commission under section 101(h)(4)(A)(ii).

SEC. 202. APPLICABILITY.

An agency shall no longer be subject to the requirements of sections 201 and 203 beginning on the date that there is no rule or set of rules of the agency classified by the Commission under section 101(h)(4)(A)(ii) that has not been repealed such that all regulatory cost reductions identified by the Commission to be achievable through repeal have been achieved.

SEC. 203. OIRA CERTIFICATION OF COST CALCULATIONS.

The Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs of the Office of Management and Budget shall review and certify the accuracy of agency determinations of the costs of new rules under section 201. The certification shall be included in the administrative record of the relevant rulemaking by the agency promulgating the rule, and the Administrator shall transmit a copy of the certification to Congress when it transmits the certification to the agency.

TITLE III—RETROSPECTIVE REVIEW OF NEW RULES

SEC. 301. PLAN FOR FUTURE REVIEW.

When an agency makes a rule, the agency shall include in the final issuance of such rule a plan for the review of such rule by not later than 10 years after the date such rule is made. Such a review, in the case of a major rule, shall be substantially similar to the review by the Commission under section 101(h). In the case of a rule other than a major rule, the agency's plan for review shall include other procedures and standards to enable the agency to determine whether to repeal or amend the rule to eliminate unnecessary

regulatory costs to the economy. Whenever feasible, the agency shall include a proposed plan for review of a proposed rule in its notice of proposed rulemaking and shall receive public comment on the plan.

TITLE IV—JUDICIAL REVIEW

SEC. 401. JUDICIAL REVIEW.

(a) IMMEDIATE REPEALS.—Agency compliance with section 101(j) of this Act shall be subject to judicial review under chapter 7 of title 5, United States Code.

(b) CUT-GO PROCEDURES.—Agency compliance with title II of this Act shall be subject to judicial review under chapter 7 of title 5, United States Code.

(c) PLANS FOR FUTURE REVIEW.—Agency compliance with section 301 shall be subject to judicial review under chapter 7 of title 5, United States Code.

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 501. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) AGENCY.—The term “agency” has the meaning given such term in section 551 of title 5, United States Code.

(2) COMMISSION.—The term “Commission” means the Retrospective Regulatory Review Commission established under section 101.

(3) MAJOR RULE.—The term “major rule” means any rule that the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs determines is likely to impose—

(A) an annual cost on the economy of \$100,000,000 or more, adjusted annually for inflation;

(B) a major increase in costs or prices for consumers, individual industries, Federal, State, local, or tribal government agencies, or geographic regions;

(C) significant adverse effects on competition, employment, investment, productivity, innovation, or on the ability of United States-based enterprises to compete with foreign-based enterprises in domestic and export markets; or

(D) significant impacts on multiple sectors of the economy.

(4) RULE.—The term “rule” has the meaning given that term in section 551 of title 5, United States Code.

(5) SET OF RULES.—The term “set of rules” means a set of rules that collectively implement a regulatory authority of an agency.

SEC. 502. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall take effect beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

The Acting CHAIR. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in House Report 115–20. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. CUMMINGS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 115–20.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Chair, as the designee of the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER), I offer amendment No. 1.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 5, line 16, insert after “reviews,” the following: “During the two-year period prior

to the inclusion of an individual on a list of candidates under this subparagraph, the individual may not have been a registered lobbyist under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.).”.

Page 6, after line 6, insert the following new paragraph:

(4) FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE REPORTS OF MEMBERS.—Each member of the Commission shall file the financial disclosure reports required under title I of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) in accordance with the requirements of such title.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 150, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Chair, I am very pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER), the maker of the amendment.

Mr. BEYER. Madam Chair, my amendment today is meant to address only one of several troubling provisions in the bill.

As my colleagues have pointed out, the SCRUB Act is a radical approach to deregulation and would prioritize cost savings through repeal of rules without considering their public benefit. The underlying bill would also prohibit agencies from making any new rules—even in the case of an imminent threat to public health or safety—unless the cost is offset by repealing an existing rule.

We have heard often on this floor my Republican friends rail against regulations promulgated by faceless bureaucrats. Well, this bill seeks to accomplish all of this through the work of an unelected commission—faceless—with virtually unlimited subpoena authority and jurisdiction over every existing regulation.

This body would work in the shadows to roll back environmental and workplace protections, putting dollars and cents over public health. The legislation grants so much in the way of authority, but comes with so little in the way of oversight, transparency, or public accountability.

President Trump and my friends on the other side of the aisle like to talk a lot about draining the swamp. Madam Chair, what the Republicans are proposing today makes a swamp look like the Hanging Gardens of Babylon, all at the cost of \$30 million to the American taxpayer.

My amendment today would bring a modicum of transparency and ethical oversight to the shadow bureaucracy by requiring commission members to follow the same financial disclosure rules as Members of Congress, congressional staff, or any Federal official.

My amendment would also ensure that commission members don't come in through the “revolving door” by inserting a requirement that the individual must not have been a registered lobbyist at any point during the previous 2 years. Congress not only has

the authority, but the duty to review existing regulations and, when necessary, to mandate reforms.

But I understand why Republicans want to delegate this work. Because who wants to be the one to recommend rolling back rules governing clean air, clean water, food safety, workplace protections, domestic violence, victim protections, and many other rules that are in place to keep Americans healthy and safe?

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment simply to give transparency, openness, and clarity to the people who will be making the decisions under the SCRUB Act.

Mr. ROSS. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROSS. Madam Chair, although I am not in opposition to the amendment, I do wish to speak in support and further explain my support, because I believe that the gentleman from Virginia offers some very good merit to his amendment.

The amendment clarifies that the commissioners are covered by the Ethics in Government Act, which is in line with current law. Commissioners should be free from financial conflict as much as any other Federal employee should. The Beyer amendment prohibits the appointment of a commissioner to the retrospective regulatory review commission who has been a registered lobbyist in the previous 2 years.

Ensuring commissioners are not lobbyists with financial interests in the commission's work is in line with the commission's goal of identifying wasteful or unfair regulations. The 2-year ban allows genuine experts with some past lobbying experience to contribute their knowledge to the commission. This provision is very similar to the President's 2-year ban on former lobbyists working in the administration.

For those reasons, I do support the amendment.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Chair, I have no further comments. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROSS. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1500

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. DESAULNIER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 115–20.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 14, after line 22, insert the following new subparagraph (and redesignate the following subparagraph accordingly):

(K) Whether, and the extent to which, the repeal of the rule or set of rules would impact public health.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 150, the gentleman from California (Mr. DESAULNIER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Chair, I rise today in support of this amendment to H.R. 998. As drafted, the SCRUB Act requires Federal agencies to repeal existing regulations to offset the cost of new regulations. The bill also authorizes up to \$30 million for a new commission to review the Code of Federal Regulations and recommend regulatory repeals.

This commonsense amendment ensures the impacts of public health, including the costs and benefits associated with those impacts, are considered under processes established by the SCRUB Act. This, I believe, is a reasonable improvement to the bill. It ensures that Federal agencies appropriately consider the true costs and benefits of Federal rules with an eye towards saving hard-earned taxpayer money.

As a member of the California State Senate, I worked with a Republican administration to help enact this legislation as the first-ever health act of its type in the country in a State. It was based on the sensible premise that understanding the impacts of government actions on public health not only saves lives, but saves money.

This effort helped provide California State agencies with the direction they needed to effectively collaborate on the complex environmental, financial, and sustainability factors that contribute to poor health and inequities. Over the 6 years of its existence, this policy has resulted in increased collaboration across large State agencies, saving taxpayer money while promoting improved public health throughout the Nation's largest State.

Today, U.S. taxpayers face a growing burden of largely preventable chronic illnesses. Heart disease, stroke, obesity, and diabetes are but a few of the myriad health issues that millions of Americans face every day that also drive many of their financial and professional decisions.

In many of our most disadvantaged communities, fewer resources are available to benefit health outcomes that are clearly seen in the levels of chronic illness in these communities and shorter life expectancies. It doesn't take a genius to connect the dots of government policies on public health in our economy.

If the goal of this legislation is eliminating existing regulations to pay for new regulations, doesn't it make business sense to understand the impacts of these decisions on our Nation's public health? For example, eliminating the Department of Labor's silica rule might save an employer the expense of

purchasing mitigation equipment, but does that employer truly save money if his health insurance premiums go up due to associated respiratory illness?

When the majority pushed to eliminate the Department of the Interior's stream protection rule, thereby allowing mountaintop mining companies to dump potentially toxic mining debris in nearby streams, there was little consideration to the costs associated with mitigating the inevitable drinking water contamination and healthcare costs of those who will be sickened after drinking contaminated water.

This amendment ensures that Federal agencies, at the very least, consider the health impacts and costs associated with eliminating a regulation. This amendment will help to go a long way in preventing unnecessary healthcare costs, which I hope we can agree is a positive improvement to the bill.

If my colleagues across the aisle insist on eliminating Federal regulations, I hope that they agree that at least we can make sure that this independent commission will at least consider the benefits of public health as they do their analysis. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this commonsense amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my amendment to H.R. 998, the SCRUB Act.

As currently drafted, the SCRUB Act requires federal agencies to repeal existing regulations to offset the cost of new regulations. The bill also authorizes up to \$30 million for a new commission to review the Code of Federal Regulations and recommend regulatory repeals.

This commonsense amendment ensures that impacts to public health, including the costs associated with those impacts, are considered under processes established by the SCRUB Act. This is a reasonable improvement to the bill ensures that federal agencies appropriately consider the true costs and benefits of federal rules with an eye towards saving hard-earned taxpayer money.

As a member of the California State Senate, I helped to enact legislation focused on promoting public health throughout the state while saving taxpayer dollars. Based on the sensible premise that understanding the impacts of government actions on public health not only saves lives, but saves money.

This effort helped provide California state agencies with the direction they needed to effectively collaborate on the complex environmental, financial, and sustainability factors that contribute to poor health and inequities. Over six years of existence, this policy has resulted in increased collaboration across state agencies, saving taxpayers money while promoting improved public health throughout the state.

Today, U.S. taxpayers face a growing burden of largely preventable chronic illnesses. Heart disease, stroke, obesity, and diabetes are but a few of the myriad health issues that millions of Americans face every day that also drive many of their financial and professional decisions.

In many of our most disadvantaged communities, fewer resources are available to benefit health outcomes that are clearly seen in the levels of chronic illness and shorter life

expectancies. It doesn't take a genius to connect the dots of government policies on public health and our economy.

If the goal of this legislation is to eliminate existing regulations to pay for new regulations, doesn't it make business sense to understand the impacts of those decisions on public health?

For example, eliminating the Department of Labor's Silica Rule might save an employer the expense of purchasing mitigation equipment, but does that employer truly save money if his health insurance premiums go up due to associated respiratory illness?

When the Majority pushed to eliminate the Interior Department's Stream Protection rule, thereby allowing mountaintop mining companies to dump potentially toxic mining debris in nearby streams, there was little consideration to the costs associated with mitigating the inevitable drinking water contamination and health care costs of those who will be sickened after drinking contaminated water.

This amendment ensures that federal agencies, at the very least, consider the health impacts and costs associated with eliminating a regulation. This effort will go a long way in preventing unnecessary health care costs, which I hope we can agree is a positive improvement to the bill.

If my colleagues across the aisle insist on eliminating federal regulations, it only makes sense to ensure that removing such rules does not harm the public.

I urge my colleagues to vote "YES" on this commonsense amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROSS. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSS. Madam Chair, this commission that we have here in the SCRUB Act is established to clear out old and unnecessary regulations. It currently requires the commission to consider whether the rule could be repealed without significant adverse effects, whether the rule is unnecessary, whether the costs are justified by the benefits, and certain other criteria.

I think that the consideration of public health certainly fits within whether the rule would have significant adverse effects, whether it is necessary, and whether the benefits justify the cost. Health, safety, and welfare of the American people is foremost to what we do, and I laud my colleague from California for filing this amendment.

This amendment clarifies that the commission should consider the impact on public health of repealing any regulation. I think that, again, my colleague from California gave fine examples of that particular balance.

We agree that we want regulations that are necessary to protect public health. I am excited to see one of my Democratic colleagues working with us to improve regulatory reform legislation. I look forward to future opportunities to continue this work.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Chair, I look forward to, in the future, working

on true bipartisan regulation. I think it is one of those areas, at least in my experience in local and State government, that we should be working in a bipartisan manner. Unfortunately, this bill I do not believe accomplishes that.

So regulatory oversight is probably the most important thing we could do, and I hope that we can do it in a bipartisan way in the future. I would encourage my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. DESAULNIER).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MS. MCSALLY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 115-20.

Ms. MCSALLY. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 14, after line 22, insert the following new subparagraph (and redesignate the subsequent subparagraph accordingly):

(K) Whether the rule or set of rules is in full compliance with the requirements of section 801(a)(1)(A) of title 5, United States Code.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 150, the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Arizona.

Ms. MCSALLY. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of the underlying legislation, H.R. 998, the SCRUB Act, and urge adoption of my amendment.

The Retrospective Regulatory Review Commission created in the SCRUB Act is an important tool to help Congress reclaim its constitutional role of serving as a check to the executive branch and will help bring back jobs and opportunity to hard-working Americans.

In 2016 alone, the Obama administration added 97,110 pages to the Federal Register. That is over 75 times more than the Bible, without any of the good news. These rules and regulations accumulate with no relief and touch every aspect of life all the way down to recordkeeping for contact lenses, vending machine food labeling, and walk-in freezer testing.

Of the over 3,500 final regulations issued in 2016, 34 will cost over \$100 million, and 105 are deemed to have significant impacts on small business. We

need to reduce this regulatory burden on American households and small businesses, which costs the economy over \$2 trillion per year.

The Congressional Review Act gives Congress 60 legislative days to introduce and pass into law a disapproval resolution overturning a rule or a regulation. Once agency actions are overturned using this process, agencies are unable to reissue, substantially in the same form, a regulation or guidance in the future.

A little known provision in the Congressional Review Act requires Federal agencies to submit to Congress and the Government Accountability Office a report on the rule or regulation. The 60-day clock for congressional action begins either when the rule is published or when Congress receives this report, whichever comes later.

Independent studies have shown many rules since 1996 have been implemented without this report, often due to Federal agencies' push to hastily implement new rules. This means that there are still many rules and regulations that may still be eligible for Congress to overturn using the Congressional Review Act disapproval resolutions process.

My amendment to the SCRUB Act requires the Retrospective Regulatory Review Commission to consider for removal rules and regulations for which Congress did not receive the report as required by the Congressional Review Act. According to GAO, approximately 29 percent of final rules failed to submit required reports in 2013. This prudent step will help give Congress the opportunity to, where appropriate, make use of the Congressional Review Act disapproval process to expedite the rollback of flawed rules and regulations that are choking our economy.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Chair, again I claim the time in opposition, but I will not oppose this amendment even though it does nothing to change the substance of the SCRUB Act or reduce the danger that it poses to the health and safety of the American public.

This amendment would add another criterion to identify which rules the commission would recommend for repeal, specifically, whether an agency has complied with the requirements of title 5 U.S.C., section 801(a)(1)(A).

That section requires agencies, prior to promulgating a rule, to submit to each House of Congress and the Comptroller General a report containing a copy of the rule; a concise general statement relating to the rule, including whether it is a major rule; and the proposed effective date of the rule.

So this amendment would require this unelected commission to report to Congress on what information Congress has or has not received. This just un-

derscores the point that Congress should do its own job rather than passing this bill to set up a commission to do our job for us.

Like the other criteria in the bill, Representative MCSALLY's amendment does nothing to address the SCRUB Act's focus on the costs of the rules. The amendment fails to make sense of the CutGo provision, which would result in the repeal of rules with little regard for how these rules have benefited and protected the American public.

The amendment fails to address the fact that agencies are already doing a retrospective review of regulations.

This amendment fails to reduce the \$30 million price tag that the American public would be responsible for paying to create the unelected commission under this bill.

The amendment fails to reduce the commission's virtually unlimited authority to subpoena witnesses or documents.

This amendment is nothing more than a window dressing, and it is nice. It does not address any of the SCRUB Act's failings and dangers that it poses to the health and safety of all Americans.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MCSALLY. Madam Chair, may I ask how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona has 2½ minutes remaining.

Ms. MCSALLY. Madam Chair, again, my amendment is simple under the SCRUB Act. Right now, these agencies are not complying with the law. They have not submitted necessary reports to Congress and the GAO. So this amendment is simply asking, among other things that are being reviewed in this act, that we take a look at which reports have not been submitted, therefore, which are not in compliance with the Congressional Review Act so that we can decide whether any of those would be appropriate for disapproval resolutions or, quite frankly, whether the rule is even one that should be enforced because it hasn't complied with the law.

This is a good amendment. I appreciate our colleagues supporting it.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARRINGTON).

Mr. ARRINGTON. Madam Chair, the cumulative cost of regulations in our country is now at the tune of \$2 trillion, and it costs us \$60 billion just to enforce those regulations every year. With all due respect, that is not window dressing. When you take a look at those numbers, it is clear to see that the bureaucratic state of our Federal Government is threatening our job creators and killing our economy.

Today, we have an opportunity to reverse course on the stifling regulations flowing from Washington by passing H.R. 998, the SCRUB Act, as amended here by my colleague, Congresswoman MARTHA MCSALLY.

The SCRUB Act will establish a commission to review existing Federal reg-

ulations and identify for Congress which of those place unnecessary costs on our economy. The amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) will take the SCRUB Act a step further by requiring this commission to consider for removal all regulations dating back to 1996 that did not comply with the law that states that there must be an accompanying report to Congress. According to the GAO, that is almost 30 percent of final rules.

All of this is done in a manner consistent with my colleague's standalone bill, the Require CRA Compliance Act, that I was also proud to join her in sponsoring.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. MCSALLY. Madam Chair, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas.

□ 1515

Mr. ARRINGTON. Madam Chair, in closing, we owe this to the American people. We owe this to my children and your grandchildren. We owe this to our local job creators to break the chains of these burdensome regulations and, once again, unleash the spirit of American innovation and enterprise that made this country the envy of the world by passing the SCRUB Act and the McSally amendment.

Ms. MCSALLY. Madam Chair, I want to thank Mr. ARRINGTON for his support. I want to thank Chairman CHAFFETZ and Mr. SMITH for their hard work on this important legislation. I want to urge the passage of my amendment and encourage my colleagues to support the underlying legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MS. PLASKETT

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 115-20.

Ms. PLASKETT. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 24, strike lines 12 through 22 and insert the following:

(k) PROHIBITION ON FUNDING.—No funds are authorized to carry out the requirements of this Act, and no funds authorized or appropriated by any other Federal law may be made available to carry out the requirements of this Act.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 150, the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Ms. PLASKETT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands.

Ms. PLASKETT. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

My amendment is simple. It rescinds the authority to spend up to \$30 million on a commission to do what Congress and the agencies already do.

If you want duplication, look no further than this bill. It seeks to reduce the size of bureaucracy by establishing a new commission to serve a function already performed without the contribution of an additional \$30 million in taxpayer funding.

Now, \$30 million may not be too much to the true benefactors of this bill on K Street, but to seniors, veterans, students, and workers all across this country, it can go a long way. For example, Social Security's meager 0.3 percent cost-of-living adjustment for 2017 amounts to \$4 more in benefits per month for the average beneficiary. That means that \$30 million would be enough to double that cost-of-living adjustment for 7.5 million seniors.

We all know that the cost of additional sequestration cuts on education, health, and the environmental protection loom at the end of this fiscal year.

The double talk and schizophrenia of my esteemed colleagues on the Oversight and Government Reform Committee who pushed this bill through the committee has me truly concerned for the mental state of this Congress. They want to defund Planned Parenthood, but want to fund a nine-member task force at a cost of \$30 million.

They drag their feet and hem and haw to assist Flint, Michigan, in funding to promote clean water and save the lives of a community, but we can sure fund a task force to duplicate already-carried-out activities by the Federal Government so we can say we did it to the tune of \$30 million.

The chair of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee wouldn't allow the people of the Virgin Islands, for 100 years as part of the United States, to receive \$100,000 already earmarked for our interior. But, we have money for this bill. And let's not discuss all the block-granting discussions going on around here in this Congress.

Today, the House majority is now asking to authorize \$30 million on a bill that would handcuff enforcement agencies in their ability to respond to even more pressing new public health and safety problems.

Let me be clear. Reducing the burden of unnecessary red tape on small businesses is a goal that we all share. I recognize that some regulation is burdensome, and there should be a review of the code to determine what can be consolidated or repealed to reduce compliance costs.

One of the things that we seem to agree on is that retrospective review is helpful in the regulatory process. But, retrospective review is already going on with money that has already been authorized. All of the agencies have been required to do this under standing executive orders issued by President Obama.

As has been discussed before, the results have been successful in reducing

regulations. Agencies have yielded billions of dollars in cost savings and reduced reporting requirements through the modification of existing regulations.

People in my district get it that there is a cost to protecting the environment, but they know that keeping our workers safe and our waters clean is worth it. There can be and is red tape that is unnecessary, and there is ongoing work and focus to eliminate and reduce that.

Could there be ways to improve upon existing review regulations? There very well may be, and I am willing to work with anyone on a good idea.

Even if \$30 million were to come from elsewhere in the budget instead of additional spending, it would be that much less that agencies would have to conduct the already ongoing retrospective review process now going on.

Furthermore, we in Congress also have existing responsibility to actively conduct oversight of government operations and make legislative changes as we see fit.

There is simply no reason to spend \$30 million on this messaging effort to ignore the successful work that is already going on by qualified people, and to hobble the ability of regulators to safeguard public health and safety in the process.

This Congress has money to throw at solutions in search of a problem, but requires cost offsets to provide aid for victims of Flint or toward Zika funding.

Please approve my amendment to save this money.

Mr. Chair, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY).

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of Ms. PLASKETT's amendment and just want to drill down on one point, which is, in the name of job creation, we have this bill before us, and we are going to spend \$30 million which will, I suppose, create some jobs here in Washington with some folks who sit on the commission and the staff who are going to have to populate it.

But just a couple of days ago, President Trump had the manufacturing CEOs of this country at the White House, and what they said was jobs exist, but skills don't; that there is a skills gap in this country, and that we need to have job training out there to connect people to these jobs.

Well, we have the Workforce Investment Act that was signed into law by President Obama in 2014, which created a framework for apprenticeship programs, advance manufacturing programs, all the things that these CEOs were talking about, and we are underfunding those programs—just to take one, the Adult Formula Grants—by just about \$30 million.

You want to create jobs? Don't spend \$30 million on this ridiculous commission when, again, we have so many other resources here in Washington to

review regulations. Let's put that money directly into the programs that will create the skill sets so that people can actually get a job to support themselves and their families. And don't take it from us, take it from the CEOs who were with President Trump just a few days ago about the fact that at a time when we have jobs in existence, the fact that we are underfunding job training programs is just totally criminal.

Let's use this \$30 million in a more productive way that will actually connect people to the jobs that are out there in the economy.

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. LONG). The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Chairman, the commission is permitted, under this bill, to spend \$30 million over 5 years for administrative purposes. By removing the funding in this amendment, the commission will not be able to hire staff, rent office space, establish the public website as required in the bill, or hold the public meetings, which are also required in the bill. This amendment essentially guts the bill.

The commission established under this bill has a momentous job ahead of it. The Code of Federal Regulations totals more than 178,000 pages. This is approximately 36,000 pages of regulations for review every year of the 5 years the commission has to conduct its work.

But it is not just simply reading the pages. There is work behind understanding whether the regulations are effective. There is outreach and public hearings to understand how the regulations are or aren't effective.

I believe the savings from eliminating unnecessary costs and the improved efficiency from weeding out unneeded regulations will far outweigh the resources applied to this effort.

The Competitive Enterprise Institute estimates that regulations impose a cost on the economy of \$1.8 trillion. Who bears that cost but the consumers? This amendment would gut the bill. \$30 million over 5 years is more than reasonable, considering the economic impact that these regulations have had on the American business and the American economy. I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment and support the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from the Virgin Islands (Ms. PLASKETT).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by

the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. MCNERNEY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 115-20.

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 31, line 17, insert after "Code" the following: " , except that the term does not include any rule relating to the physical and cyber security of the bulk-power system (as defined in section 215(a) of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 824o(a)), including any emergency action to protect and restore reliability of the bulk-power system".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 150, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCNERNEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is straightforward. It exempts from the bill any agency rule relating to the physical and cybersecurity of the bulk power system, including any emergency action to protect and restore reliability. The bulk power system is comprised of facilities and control systems necessary for operating an interconnected electrical transmission network to maintain reliability.

Our Nation's electrical system touches each and every part of our lives, hospitals, schools, transportation, homes, businesses, and our national security. Our electrical system is the central element of our Nation's critical infrastructure because all other components of our infrastructure depend on it.

The electrical system is composed of 640,000 miles of high-voltage transmission lines and more than 6 million miles of distribution lines. This network is undergoing a transformation. There are an ever-increasing number of devices that are connected to the grid; technological advancements are allowing for efficiencies and cheaper production of power, whether it is renewable energy or natural gas; and consumers have more choices and more control. With increased digitization, automation and interaction also have enhanced grid flexibility and security.

While these developments present tremendous opportunities, such as new jobs and reducing carbon emissions, they also pose additional physical and cyber threats to the transmission and distribution systems. Stakeholders across the system are facing numerous new threats and challenges in detecting problems, responding to intrusions, and keeping rates affordable while maintaining reliability. The long-term health of the electricity sector is now, more than ever, a shared responsibility between communities, consumers, industry, and government.

Despite these challenges, the bulk power system is an example of industry

stakeholders and the Federal Government working well together, when needed, and working independently, when needed and succeeding.

Transmission and distribution providers have taken it upon themselves to establish industry-led standards, best practices, and supply chain management when it comes to grid security. They have worked well with NERC and FERC in developing Critical Infrastructure Protection standards for the bulk power system.

These Critical Infrastructure Protection standards cover critical cyber asset identification, security management, personnel and training, electronic security, physical security, systems security, incident reporting and response planning, and recovery plans. There are 72 inactive CIP standards, and 11 that are now subject to enforcement. These standards aren't always perfect, but they do represent compromise and collaboration.

A well-protected and reliable grid makes economic sense. Power outages and disturbances can cost more than \$180 billion annually, and data suggests that electrical system outages attributable to weather-related events are increasing, costing the U.S. economy an estimated \$20 billion to \$55 billion annually. Electric companies are projected to spend more than \$7 billion of their own money on cybersecurity alone by the year 2020, and are expected to invest nearly \$53 billion to enhance the grid.

□ 1530

These are significant investments, but essential investments as well. A more resilient, secure electric sector is something we all benefit from. It will continue to require investments at all levels, including from the Federal Government.

We should enhance funding for our national laboratories that have partnered together via the Grid Modernization Lab Consortium. We should provide high levels of funding for the Office of Electricity and its mission to ensure the energy delivery system is more secure, resilient, and reliable. We must promote R&D that helps bring new, innovative technologies to the grid.

We will always struggle to keep ahead of those bad actors who are seeking to attack us, but we can establish metrics, procedures, and technological capabilities that allow us to respond and adapt.

I agree with many of my colleagues that we should work to identify and remove regulations that are no longer relevant. The Critical Infrastructure Protection standards have worked. My amendment ensures that Federal agencies will have the flexibility needed to respond to challenges without sacrificing any other necessary protections.

I urge my colleagues to adopt this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Chairman, this bill requires the commission to identify regulations that should be repealed. These are all regulations under the bill. While I appreciate my colleague from California's efforts in his amendment, I just cannot support it.

The commission focuses on rules and regulations that are out of date, no longer useful, and otherwise unnecessary or obsolete. No regulations should be exempt from this bill.

Ensuring the physical and cybersecurity of the bulk power system is absolutely important and critical. We should know whether or not the existing regulations are effective and are useful.

This amendment would prevent the commission from reviewing these important regulations and ensuring that they are current and effective.

I would urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCNERNEY).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. KRISHNAMOORTHY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in House Report 115-20.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 31, after line 24, add the following new title (and update the table of contents accordingly):

TITLE VI—EXEMPTIONS

SEC. 601. EXEMPTION RELATING TO NATIONAL AIRSPACE SYSTEM.

The provisions of this Act do not apply to any rule or set of rules relating to the safety of the national airspace system.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 150, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Chairman, my amendment today is a probusiness, pro-innovation amendment. This would exempt any regulations that affect the safety of our National Airspace System.

It is important to note that commercial drone operations are only possible because of FAA rules. Last August, the FAA's small UAS rule—unmanned aerial systems rule—opened the door for small businesses to use unmanned systems easily and without cumbersome paperwork.

The current inaction on the “flights over people” rule could limit UAS operations, such as news reporting, disaster relief, and public safety from becoming a reality. As a result, many businesses and the country could lose out on the full societal and economic benefits of UAS.

Once UAS are fully integrated into the national airspace, the full benefits of these tools will help businesses to expand and our economy to grow—with a projected 100,000 jobs and over \$82 billion in economic impact over the next decade. That is why this particular amendment is supported by the UAV Coalition as well as the Automated Vehicles Symposium.

But we need action from regulatory authorities to fully integrate UAS into our airspace. Without my amendment, the SCRUB Act has the potential to stifle a growing industry and prevent the modernization of air traffic. I want to reiterate: UAS operators need guidance and regulations from the FAA so they can operate safely and without unnecessary paperwork.

I urge the House to support my amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Chairman, as I mentioned earlier, the bill requires the commission to identify regulations—all regulations—which should be repealed. The commission focuses on rules and regulations that are out of date, no longer useful, and otherwise unnecessary or obsolete. Again, no regulations should be exempt from this bill.

Ensuring the safety of the National Airspace System is critically important. We should know whether or not the existing regulations are effective and useful. This amendment would prevent the commission from reviewing these very important regulations and ensuring that they are not only current but also effective.

I, therefore, urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Chairman, investments into this particular industry are predicated on whether or not regulations are predictable. As a former small-business man, I can tell you that investments will not happen if there is an unelected commission that exists that might change the very rules and regulations upon which current investments have been made.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Chairman, while I appreciate the argument about an unelected commission, I must say that these regulations are already being promulgated by unelected, unaccountable bureaucrats.

Again, if we are going to have to have a review—an oversight—of our regulatory scheme, we should not exempt any regulations. I, therefore, would submit that this amendment would do just that. It would create a slippery slope of exceptions. Therefore, I, again, would urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Chairman, as a small-business man, I can tell you that small businesses rely on the predictability of regulatory rules and the regulatory regime. This commission is creating unpredictability in the system. Therefore, it is going to stifle investment, it is going to prevent innovation, and it is going to further throw a monkey wrench into our National Airspace System.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. KRISHNAMOORTHY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in House Report 115-20.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 31, after line 24, add the following new title (and update the table of contents accordingly):

TITLE VI—EXEMPTIONS

SEC. 601. EXEMPTION RELATING TO AIRPORT NOISE RESTRICTIONS.

The provisions of this Act do not apply to any rule or set of rules relating to airport noise restrictions.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 150, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Chairman, my second amendment to the SCRUB Act would protect the countless citizens, including many of my own constituents, who depend on airport noise restrictions to sleep through the night or learn uninterrupted in school.

Thousands of my constituents near O'Hare International Airport benefit from these restrictions, as do the millions of people that live near major airports across the country. As the father of a 10-month-old baby girl, I can speak from experience to the value of an uninterrupted night of sleep.

Many FAA noise rules are the product of careful discussions between airports and local authorities. While noise restrictions have a slight economic impact on air carriers, the economic benefit to surrounding communities more than outweighs this.

The unelected commission created by this bill should not have the ability to overturn restrictions that have been carefully considered by local governments, the FAA, and airport officials.

Without FAA noise restrictions, people and businesses would suffer, Mr. Chairman. This would decrease property values in my district, make it harder for people to start a business, and have a negative effect on people's health.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Chairman, everyone agrees that airport noise is very annoying.

Effective regulations that protect our communities from unwarranted noise are very important. However, regulations that impose excessive and costly restrictions that are ineffective at achieving their goals do not help anyone.

Why not take a look at these regulations and just consider whether they are working?

If they are, then the regulation stays in place and we continue to protect our communities from unwarranted noise. If those regulations are not working, then we repeal them and put in regulations that achieve the goals and reduce costs.

There is no reason why we should create special carve-outs from the commission's consideration.

For those reasons, Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Chairman, these particular rules and regulations were crafted carefully at the local level, and I believe very strongly that this commission, which is a Federal commission, should not somehow upset the balance that has been achieved through local voices having a say in these particular regulations.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Chairman, I will tell you that regulations are regulations. They need to be reviewed at every level. What the SCRUB Act offers is that opportunity. What this amendment does is limit that ability.

For those reasons, I, again, urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Chairman, the SCRUB Act should not have the ability to review regulations and rules that were developed by local people with local concerns in mind.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 115-20 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. DESAULNIER of California.

Amendment No. 4 by Ms. PLASKETT of the Virgin Islands.

Amendment No. 6 by Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY of Illinois.

Amendment No. 7 by Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY of Illinois.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. DESAULNIER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. DESAULNIER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 348, noes 75, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 105]

AYES—348

Adams	Black	Butterfield
Aguilar	Blackburn	Calvert
Amash	Blum	Capuano
Bacon	Blumenauer	Carbajal
Barletta	Blunt Rochester	Cárdenas
Barragán	Bonamici	Carson (IN)
Bass	Bost	Cartwright
Beatty	Boyle, Brendan	Castor (FL)
Bera	F.	Castro (TX)
Bergman	Brady (PA)	Chabot
Beyer	Brooks (IN)	Chaffetz
Bilirakis	Brown (MD)	Cheney
Bishop (GA)	Brownley (CA)	Chu, Judy
Bishop (MI)	Buchanan	Cicilline
Bishop (UT)	Bustos	Clark (MA)

Clarke (NY)	Hunter	Perlmutter
Clay	Hurd	Peters
Cleaver	Issa	Peterson
Clyburn	Jackson Lee	Pingree
Coffman	Jayapal	Pocan
Cohen	Jeffries	Poliquin
Cole	Jenkins (KS)	Polis
Collins (GA)	Jenkins (WV)	Price (NC)
Collins (NY)	Johnson (GA)	Quigley
Comer	Johnson (LA)	Raskin
Comstock	Johnson (OH)	Ratcliffe
Conaway	Johnson, E. B.	Reed
Connolly	Jones	Reichert
Conyers	Joyce (OH)	Renacci
Cooper	Kaptur	Rice (NY)
Correa	Katko	Rice (SC)
Costa	Keating	Richmond
Costello (PA)	Kelly (IL)	Roby
Courtney	Kennedy	Roe (TN)
Cramer	Khanna	Rogers (AL)
Crist	Kihuen	Rogers (KY)
Crowley	Kildee	Rohrabacher
Cuellar	Kilmer	Rokita
Culberson	Kind	Rooney, Francis
Cummings	King (NY)	Ros-Lehtinen
Curbelo (FL)	Kinzinger	Rosen
Davis (CA)	Knight	Roskam
Davis, Danny	Krishnamoorthi	Ross
DeFazio	Kuster (NH)	Rothfus
DeGette	Lance	Rouzer
Delaney	Langevin	Roybal-Allard
DeLauro	Larsen (WA)	Royce (CA)
DelBene	Larson (CT)	Ruiz
Demings	Latta	Ruppersberger
Denham	Lawrence	Rush
Dent	Lawson (FL)	Rutherford
DeSantis	Lee	Ryan (OH)
DeSaulnier	Levin	Sánchez
Deutch	Lewis (GA)	Sanford
Diaz-Balart	Lewis (MN)	Sarbanes
Dingell	Lieu, Ted	Schakowsky
Doggett	Lipinski	Schiff
Donovan	LoBiondo	Schneider
Doyle, Michael	Loeb sack	Schrader
F.	Lofgren	Schweikert
Duffy	Long	Scott (VA)
Dunn	Loudermilk	Scott, David
Ellison	Love	Serrano
Emmer	Lowenthal	Sewell (AL)
Engel	Lowe	Shea-Porter
Eshoo	Luetkemeyer	Sherman
Españolat	Lujan Grisham,	Shimkus
Esty	M.	Shuster
Evans	Luján, Ben Ray	Simpson
Farenthold	Lynch	Sinema
Faso	MacArthur	Sires
Fitzpatrick	Maloney,	Slaughter
Flores	Carolyn B.	Smith (NJ)
Fortenberry	Maloney, Sean	Smith (TX)
Foster	Marchant	Smith (WA)
Fox	Marshall	Smucker
Frankel (FL)	Mast	Soto
Franks (AZ)	Matsui	Speier
Frelinghuysen	McCaul	Stefanik
Fudge	McCollum	Stewart
Gabbard	McEachin	Stivers
Gallagher	McGovern	Suozzi
Gallego	McHenry	Swalwell (CA)
Garamendi	McKinley	Takano
Gonzalez (TX)	McMorris	Taylor
Goodlatte	McMorris	Tenney
Gottheimer	McSally	Thompson (CA)
Gowdy	Meadows	Thompson (MS)
Granger	Meehan	Thompson (PA)
Graves (LA)	Meeks	Thornberry
Graves (MO)	Meng	Tiberi
Green, Al	Mitchell	Tipton
Green, Gene	Moolenaar	Titus
Griffith	Moulton	Tonko
Grijalva	Mullin	Torres
Guthrie	Murphy (FL)	Trott
Gutiérrez	Murphy (PA)	Tsongas
Hanabusa	Nadler	Upton
Harper	Napolitano	Valadao
Hart	Neal	Vargas
Hartzer	Newhouse	Veasey
Hastings	Nolan	Vela
Heck	Norcross	Velázquez
Hensarling	O'Halleran	Visclosky
Herrera Beutler	O'Rourke	Walberg
Higgins (LA)	Olson	Walden
Higgins (NY)	Pallone	Walorski
Hill	Palmer	Walters, Mimi
Himes	Panetta	Walz
Holding	Pascarell	Wasserman
Hoyer	Paulsen	Schultz
Huffman	Payne	Waters, Maxine
Huizenga	Pelosi	Watson Coleman
Hultgren		Welch

Wenstrup	Womack	Yoho
Westerman	Woodall	Young (AK)
Wilson (FL)	Yarmuth	Young (IA)
Wilson (SC)	Yoder	Zeldin

NOES—75

Abraham	Ferguson	McCarthy
Aderholt	Fleischmann	McClintock
Allen	Gaetz	Messer
Amodel	Garrett	Mooney (WV)
Arrington	Gibbs	Noem
Babin	Gohmert	Nunes
Banks (IN)	Gosar	Palazzo
Barr	Graves (GA)	Pearce
Barton	Grothman	Perry
Biggs	Harris	Pittenger
Brady (TX)	Hice, Jody B.	Poe (TX)
Brat	Hollingsworth	Posey
Bridenstine	Johnson, Sam	Russell
Brooks (AL)	Jordan	Scalise
Buck	Kelly (MS)	Scott, Austin
Bucshon	Kelly (PA)	Sensenbrenner
Budd	King (IA)	Sessions
Burgess	Kustoff (TN)	Smith (MO)
Byrne	Labrador	Smith (NE)
Carter (GA)	LaHood	Turner
Carter (TX)	LaMalfa	Walker
Cook	Lamborn	Weber (TX)
DesJarlais	Lucas	Webster (FL)
Duncan (SC)	Marino	Williams
Duncan (TN)	Massie	Wittman

NOT VOTING—7

Crawford	Moore	Wagner
Davis, Rodney	Rooney, Thomas	Zinke
Hudson	J.	

□ 1611

Messrs. BRAT, WILLIAMS, KELLY of Mississippi, GAETZ, PITTENGER, WALKER, GROTHMAN, KING of Iowa, BRIDENSTINE, SMITH of Missouri, MASSIE, CARTER of Georgia, and WITTMAN changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Ms. DEGETTE, Messrs. RICE of South Carolina, ISSA, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Messrs. LOBIONDO, HOLDING, ROUZER, NORCROSS, WOMACK, RASKIN, COLLINS of Georgia, Mrs. WALORSKI, Messrs. GENE GREEN of Texas, WOODALL, Ms. GRANGER, Messrs. COLE, SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, GUTHRIE, UPTON, MCCAUL, TIPTON, ROSKAM, DESANTIS, SHIMKUS, Ms. HANABUSA, Messrs. COHEN, RUTHERFORD, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, and Mr. SMUCKER changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MS. PLASKETT

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia). The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from the Virgin Islands (Ms. PLASKETT) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 181, noes 243, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 106]

AYES—181

Adams	Frankel (FL)	Nadler
Aguilar	Fudge	Napolitano
Barragán	Gabbard	Neal
Bass	Gallego	Nolan
Beatty	Garamendi	Norcross
Bera	Gonzalez (TX)	O'Rourke
Beyer	Green, Al	Pallone
Bishop (GA)	Green, Gene	Panetta
Blumenauer	Grijalva	Pascrell
Blunt Rochester	Gutiérrez	Payne
Bonamici	Hanabusa	Pelosi
Boyle, Brendan	Hastings	Perlmutter
F.	Heck	Pingree
Brady (PA)	Higgins (NY)	Pocan
Brown (MD)	Himes	Polis
Brownley (CA)	Hoyer	Price (NC)
Bustos	Huffman	Quigley
Butterfield	Jackson Lee	Raskin
Capuano	Jayapal	Rice (NY)
Carbajal	Jeffries	Richmond
Cárdenas	Johnson (GA)	Roybal-Allard
Carson (IN)	Johnson, E. B.	Ruiz
Cartwright	Kaptur	Ruppersberger
Castor (FL)	Keating	Rush
Castro (TX)	Kelly (IL)	Ryan (OH)
Chu, Judy	Kennedy	Sánchez
Cicilline	Khanna	Sarbanes
Clark (MA)	Kihuen	Schakowsky
Clarke (NY)	Kildee	Schiff
Clay	Kilmer	Schneider
Cleaver	Kind	Scott (VA)
Clyburn	Krishnamoorthi	Scott, David
Cohen	Kuster (NH)	Serrano
Connolly	Langevin	Sewell (AL)
Conyers	Larsen (WA)	Shea-Porter
Cooper	Larson (CT)	Sherman
Correa	Lawrence	Sires
Courtney	Lawson (FL)	Slaughter
Crist	Lee	Smith (WA)
Crowley	Levin	Soto
Cummings	Lewis (GA)	Speier
Davis (CA)	Lieu, Ted	Swalwell (CA)
Davis, Danny	Lipinski	Takano
DeFazio	Loeb sack	Thompson (CA)
DeGette	Lofgren	Thompson (MS)
Delaney	Lowenthal	Titus
DeLauro	Lowe y	Tonko
DelBene	Lujan Grisham,	Torres
Demings	M.	Tsongas
DeSaulnier	Luján, Ben Ray	Vargas
Deutch	Lynch	Veasey
Dingell	Maloney,	Vela
Doggett	Carolyn B.	Velázquez
Doyle, Michael	Maloney, Sean	Visclosky
F.	Matsui	Walz
Ellison	McCollum	Wasserman
Engel	McEachin	Schultz
Eshoo	McGovern	Waters, Maxine
Espallat	McNerney	Watson Coleman
Esty	Meeks	Welch
Evans	Meng	Wilson (FL)
Foster	Moulton	Yarmuth

NOES—243

Abraham	Calvert	Emmer
Aderholt	Carter (GA)	Farenthold
Allen	Carter (TX)	Faso
Amash	Chabot	Ferguson
Amodei	Chaffetz	Fitzpatrick
Arrington	Cheney	Fleischmann
Babin	Coffman	Flores
Bacon	Cole	Fortenberry
Banks (IN)	Collins (GA)	Foxx
Barletta	Collins (NY)	Franks (AZ)
Barr	Comer	Frelinghuysen
Barton	Comstock	Gaetz
Bergman	Conaway	Gallagher
Biggs	Cook	Garrett
Billirakis	Costa	Gibbs
Bishop (MI)	Costello (PA)	Gohmert
Bishop (UT)	Cramer	Goodlatte
Black	Crawford	Gosar
Blackburn	Cuellar	Gottheimer
Blum	Culberson	Gowdy
Bost	Curbelo (FL)	Granger
Brady (TX)	Davidson	Graves (GA)
Brat	Denham	Graves (LA)
Bridenstine	Dent	Graves (MO)
Brooks (AL)	DeSantis	Griffith
Brooks (IN)	DesJarlais	Grothman
Buchanan	Diaz-Balart	Guthrie
Buck	Donovan	Harper
Bucshon	Duffy	Harris
Budd	Duncan (SC)	Hartzler
Burgess	Duncan (TN)	Hensarling
Byrne	Dunn	Herrera Beutler

Hice, Jody B.	McMorris	Scalise
Higgins (LA)	Rodgers	Schrader
Hill	McSally	Schweikert
Holding	Meadows	Scott, Austin
Hollingsworth	Meehan	Sensenbrenner
Huizenga	Messer	Sessions
Hultgren	Mitchell	Shimkus
Hunter	Moolenaar	Shuster
Hurd	Mooney (WV)	Simpson
Issa	Mullin	Sinema
Jenkins (KS)	Murphy (FL)	Smith (MO)
Jenkins (WV)	Murphy (PA)	Smith (NE)
Johnson (LA)	Newhouse	Smith (NJ)
Johnson (OH)	Noem	Smith (TX)
Johnson, Sam	Nunes	Smucker
Jones	O'Halleran	Stefanik
Jordan	Olson	Stewart
Joyce (OH)	Palazzo	Stivers
Katko	Palmer	Suozzi
Kelly (MS)	Paulsen	Taylor
Kelly (PA)	Pearce	Tenney
King (IA)	Perry	Thompson (PA)
King (NY)	Peters	Thornberry
Kinzinger	Peterson	Tiberi
Knight	Pittenger	Tipton
Kustoff (TN)	Poe (TX)	Trott
Labrador	Poliquin	Turner
LaHood	Posey	Upton
LaMalfa	Ratcliffe	Valadao
Lamborn	Reed	Walberg
Lance	Reichert	Walden
Latta	Renacci	Walker
Lewis (MN)	Rice (SC)	Walorski
LoBiondo	Roby	Walters, Mimi
Long	Roe (TN)	Weber (TX)
Loudermilk	Rogers (AL)	Webster (FL)
Love	Rogers (KY)	Wenstrup
Lucas	Rohrabacher	Westerman
Luetkemeyer	Rokita	Williams
MacArthur	Rooney, Francis	Wilson (SC)
Marchant	Ros-Lehtinen	Wittman
Marino	Rosen	Womack
Marshall	Roskam	Woodall
Massie	Ross	Yoder
Mast	Rothfus	Yoho
McCarthy	Rouzer	Young (AK)
McCaul	Royce (CA)	Young (IA)
McClintock	Russell	Zeldin
McHenry	Rutherford	
McKinley	Sanford	

NOT VOTING—6

Davis, Rodney	Rooney, Thomas	Zinke
Hudson	J.	
Moore	Wagner	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1614

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR.

KRISHNAMOORTHY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 189, noes 234, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 107]

AYES—189

Adams	Gabbard	Norcross
Aguilar	Gallego	O'Halleran
Barragán	Garamendi	O'Rourke
Bass	Gonzalez (TX)	Pallone
Beatty	Gottheimer	Panetta
Bera	Green, Al	Pascarell
Beyer	Green, Gene	Payne
Bishop (GA)	Grijalva	Pelosi
Blumenauer	Gutiérrez	Perlmutter
Blunt Rochester	Hanabusa	Peters
Bonamici	Hastings	Peterson
Boyle, Brendan	Heck	Pingree
F.	Higgins (NY)	Pocan
Brady (PA)	Himes	Polis
Brown (MD)	Hoyer	Price (NC)
Brownley (CA)	Huffman	Quigley
Bustos	Jayapal	Raskin
Butterfield	Jeffries	Rice (NY)
Capuano	Johnson (GA)	Richmond
Carbajal	Johnson, E. B.	Rosen
Cárdenas	Kaptur	Roybal-Allard
Carson (IN)	Keating	Ruiz
Cartwright	Kelly (IL)	Ruppersberger
Castor (FL)	Kennedy	Rush
Castro (TX)	Khanna	Ryan (OH)
Chu, Judy	Kihuen	Sánchez
Cicilline	Kildee	Sarbanes
Clark (MA)	Kilmer	Schakowsky
Clarke (NY)	Kind	Schiff
Clay	Krishnamoorthi	Schneider
Cleaver	Kuster (NH)	Schrader
Clyburn	Langevin	Scott (VA)
Cohen	Larsen (WA)	Scott, David
Connolly	Larson (CT)	Serrano
Conyers	Lawrence	Sewell (AL)
Cooper	Lawson (FL)	Shea-Porter
Correa	Lee	Sherman
Courtney	Levin	Sinema
Crist	Lewis (GA)	Sires
Crowley	Lieu, Ted	Slaughter
Cuellar	Lipinski	Smith (WA)
Cummings	LoBiondo	Soto
Davis (CA)	Loeb sack	Speier
Davis, Danny	Lofgren	Swalwell (CA)
DeFazio	Lowenthal	Takano
DeGette	Lowe y	Thompson (CA)
Delaney	Lujan Grisham,	Thompson (MS)
DeLauro	M.	Titus
DelBene	Luján, Ben Ray	Tonko
Demings	Lynch	Torres
DeSaulnier	Maloney,	Tsongas
Deutch	Carolyn B.	Vargas
Dingell	Matsui	Veasey
Doggett	McCollum	Vela
Doyle, Michael	McEachin	Velázquez
F.	McGovern	Visclosky
Ellison	McNerney	Walz
Engel	Meeks	Wasserman
Eshoo	Meng	Schultz
Espallat	Moulton	Waters, Maxine
Esty	Murphy (FL)	Watson Coleman
Evans	Nadler	Welch
Foster	Napolitano	Wilson (FL)
Frankel (FL)	Neal	Yarmuth
Fudge	Nolan	

NOES—234

Abraham	Budd	Donovan
Aderholt	Burgess	Duffy
Allen	Byrne	Duncan (SC)
Amash	Calvert	Duncan (TN)
Amodei	Carter (GA)	Dunn
Arrington	Carter (TX)	Emmer
Babin	Chabot	Farenthold
Bacon	Chaffetz	Faso
Banks (IN)	Cheney	Ferguson
Barletta	Coffman	Fitzpatrick
Barr	Cole	Fleischmann
Barton	Collins (GA)	Flores
Bergman	Collins (NY)	Fortenberry
Biggs	Comer	Foxx
Billirakis	Comstock	Franks (AZ)
Bishop (MI)	Conaway	Frelinghuysen
Bishop (UT)	Cook	Gaetz
Black	Costa	Gallagher
Blackburn	Costello (PA)	Garrett
Blum	Cramer	Gibbs
Bost	Crawford	Gohmert
Brady (TX)	Culberson	Goodlatte
Brat	Curbelo (FL)	Gosar
Bridenstine	Davidson	Gowdy
Brooks (AL)	Denham	Granger
Brooks (IN)	Dent	Graves (GA)
Buchanan	DeSantis	Graves (LA)
Buck	DesJarlais	Graves (MO)
Bucshon	Diaz-Balart	Griffith

Grothman
Guthrie
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lewis (MN)
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Marshall

Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaull
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Newhouse
Noem
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell

Rutherford
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Suozi
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—7

Davis, Rodney
Hudson
Maloney, Sean

Moore
Rooney, Thomas J.

Wagner
Zinke

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1618

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR.
KRISHNAMOORTHY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 192, noes 230, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 108]

AYES—192

Adams
Aguilera
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clever
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Correa
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Español
Esty
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego

Garamendi
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildeer
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebbeck
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halloran

O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascarella
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rohrabacher
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Suozi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—230

Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Cheney
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Culberson
Curbello (FL)
Davidson
Denham
Dent
DeSantis

DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foss
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)

Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lewis (MN)
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur

Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaull
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Newhouse
Noem
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus

Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—8

Chu, Judy
Davis, Rodney
Hensarling
Hudson

Moore
Rooney, Thomas J.
Wagner

Zinke

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1622

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.
Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Chairman, I
move that the Committee do now rise.
The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose;
and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr.
JOYCE) having assumed the chair, Mr.
COLLINS of Georgia, Acting Chair of the
Committee of the Whole House on the
state of the Union, reported that that
Committee, having had under consider-
ation the bill (H.R. 998) to provide for
the establishment of a process for the
review of rules and sets of rules, and
for other purposes, had come to no res-
olution thereon.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PRO-
VIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF
H.R. 1004, REGULATORY INTEG-
RITY ACT OF 2017, AND PRO-
VIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF
H.R. 1009, OIRA INSIGHT, RE-
FORM, AND ACCOUNTABILITY
ACT

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee
on Rules, submitted a privileged report

(Rept. No. 115–21) on the resolution (H. Res. 156) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1004) to amend chapter 3 of title 5, United States Code, to require the publication of information relating to pending agency regulatory actions, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1009) to amend title 44, United States Code, to require the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs to review regulations, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia). After consultation among the Speaker and the majority and minority leaders, and with their consent, the Chair announces that, when the two Houses meet tonight in joint session to hear an address by the President of the United States, only the doors immediately opposite the Speaker and those immediately to his left and right will be open.

No one will be allowed on the floor of the House who does not have the privilege of the floor of the House. Due to the large attendance that is anticipated, the rule regarding the privilege of the floor must be strictly enforced. Children of Members will not be permitted on the floor. The cooperation of all Members is requested.

The practice of purporting to reserve seats prior to the joint session by placement of placards or personal items will not be allowed. Chamber Security may remove these items from the seats. Members may reserve their seats only by physical presence following the security sweep of the Chamber.

All Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in still photography or audio or video recording in the Chamber. Taking unofficial photographs detracts from the dignity of the proceedings and presents security and privacy challenges for the House.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 8:35 p.m. for the purpose of receiving in joint session the President of the United States.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 27 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 2035

JOINT SESSION OF CONGRESS PURSUANT TO HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 23 TO RE- CEIVE A MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 8 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.

The Assistant to the Sergeant at Arms, Ms. Kathleen Joyce, announced the Vice President and Members of the U.S. Senate, who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, the Vice President taking the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. The joint session will come to order.

The Chair appoints as members of the committee on the part of the House to escort the President of the United States into the Chamber:

The gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY);

The gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE);

The gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS);

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STIVERS);

The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER);

The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS);

The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH);

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI);

The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER);

The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN);

The gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY);

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. SÁNCHEZ);

The gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN); and

The gentleman from California (Mr. SWALWELL).

The VICE PRESIDENT. The President of the Senate, at the direction of that body, appoints the following Senators as members of the committee on the part of the Senate to escort the President of the United States into the House Chamber:

The Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL);

The Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN);

The Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH);

The Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE);

The Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO);

The Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT);

The Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER);

The Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER);

The Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN);

The Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY);

The Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY);

The Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW);

The Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR); and

The Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN).

The Assistant to the Sergeant at Arms announced the Dean of the Diplo-

matic Corps, His Excellency Hersey Kyota, the Ambassador of the Republic of Palau.

The Dean of the Diplomatic Corps entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seat reserved for him.

The Assistant to the Sergeant at Arms announced the Chief Justice of the United States and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court.

The Chief Justice of the United States and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

The Assistant to the Sergeant at Arms announced the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

The members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

At 9 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m., the Sergeant at Arms, the Honorable Paul D. Irving, announced the President of the United States.

The President of the United States, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and stood at the Clerk's desk.

(Applause, the Members rising.)

The SPEAKER. Members of the Congress, I have the high privilege and the distinct honor of presenting to you the President of the United States.

(Applause, the Members rising.)

The PRESIDENT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Vice President, Members of Congress, the First Lady of the United States, and citizens of America:

Tonight, as we mark the conclusion of our celebration of Black History Month, we are reminded of our Nation's path towards civil rights and the work that still remains to be done.

Recent threats targeting Jewish community centers and vandalism of Jewish cemeteries, as well as last week's shooting in Kansas City, remind us that, while we may be a nation divided on policies, we are a country that stands united in condemning hate and evil in all of its very ugly forms.

Each American generation passes the torch of truth, liberty, and justice—in an unbroken chain all the way down to the present. That torch is now in our hands, and we will use it to light up the world. I am here tonight to deliver a message of unity and strength, and it is a message deeply delivered from my heart.

A new chapter of American greatness is now beginning. A new national pride is sweeping across our Nation. And a new surge of optimism is placing impossible dreams firmly within our grasp. What we are witnessing today is the renewal of the American spirit.

Our allies will find that America is once again ready to lead.

All the nations of the world, friend or foe, will find that America is strong, America is proud, and America is free.

In 9 years, the United States will celebrate the 250th anniversary of our founding, 250 years since the day we declared our independence. It will be one of the great milestones in the history of the world.

But what will America look like as we reach our 250th year? What kind of country will we leave for our children?

I will not allow the mistakes of recent decades past to define the course of our future.

For too long we have watched our middle class shrink as we have exported our jobs and wealth to foreign countries. We have financed and built one global project after another but ignored the fates of our children in the inner cities of Chicago, Baltimore, Detroit, and so many other places throughout our land. We have defended the borders of other nations while leaving our own borders wide open for anyone to cross and for drugs to pour in at a now unprecedented rate. And we have spent trillions and trillions of dollars overseas, while our infrastructure at home has so badly crumbled.

Then, in 2016, the Earth shifted beneath our feet. The rebellion started as a quiet protest, spoken by families of all colors and creeds, families who just wanted a fair shot for their children and a fair hearing for their concerns. But then the quiet voices became a loud chorus, as thousands of citizens now spoke out together from cities small and large all across our country. Finally, the chorus became an earthquake and the people turned out by the tens of millions, and they were all united by one very simple but crucial demand: that America must put its own citizens first, because only then can we truly make America great again.

Dying industries will come roaring back to life. Heroic veterans will get the care they so desperately need. Our military will be given the resources its brave warriors so richly deserve. Crumbling infrastructure will be replaced with new roads, bridges, tunnels, airports, and railways gleaming across our very, very beautiful land.

Our terrible drug epidemic will slow down and ultimately stop, and our neglected inner cities will see a rebirth of hope, safety, and opportunity. Above all else, we will keep our promises to the American people.

It has been a little over a month since my inauguration, and I want to take this moment to update the Nation on the progress I have made in keeping those promises.

Since my election, Ford, Fiat Chrysler, General Motors, Sprint, Softbank, Lockheed, Intel, Walmart, and many others have announced that they will invest billions and billions of dollars in the United States and will create tens of thousands of new American jobs.

The stock market has gained almost \$3 trillion in value since the election on November 8—a record. We have saved taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars by bringing down the price of

the fantastic, and it is a fantastic new F-35 jet fighter. And we will be saving billions more on contracts all across our government.

We have placed a hiring freeze on nonmilitary and nonessential Federal workers. We have begun to drain the swamp of government corruption by imposing a 5-year ban on lobbying by executive branch officials, and a lifetime ban on becoming lobbyists for a foreign government.

We have undertaken a historic effort to massively reduce job-crushing regulations, creating a deregulation task force inside of every government agency. And we are imposing a new rule which mandates that for every one new regulation, two old regulations must be eliminated. We are going to stop the regulations that threaten the future and livelihood of our great coal miners.

We have cleared the way for the construction of the Keystone and Dakota Access pipelines, thereby creating tens of thousands of jobs. And I have issued a new directive that new American pipelines be made with American steel.

We have withdrawn the United States from the job-killing Trans-Pacific Partnership.

With the help of Prime Minister Justin Trudeau, we have formed a council with our neighbors in Canada to help ensure that women entrepreneurs have access to the networks, markets, and capital they need to start a business and live out their financial dreams.

To protect our citizens, I have directed the Department of Justice to form a task force on reducing violent crime. I have further ordered the Departments of Homeland Security and Justice, along with the Department of State and the Director of National Intelligence, to coordinate an aggressive strategy to dismantle the criminal cartels that have spread all across our Nation. We will stop the drugs from pouring into our country and poisoning our youth, and we will expand treatment for those who have become so badly addicted.

At the same time, my administration has answered the pleas of the American people for immigration enforcement and border security. By finally enforcing our immigration laws, we will raise wages, help the unemployed, save billions and billions of dollars, and make our communities safer for everyone.

We want all Americans to succeed, but that can't happen in an environment of lawless chaos. We must restore integrity and the rule of law at our borders. For that reason, we will soon begin the construction of a great, great wall along our southern border. As we speak tonight, we are removing gang members, drug dealers, and criminals that threaten our communities and prey on our very innocent citizens. Bad ones are going out as I speak, and as I promised throughout the campaign.

To any in Congress who do not believe we should enforce our laws, I would ask you this one question: What would you say to the American family

that loses their jobs, their income, or their loved one because America refused to uphold its laws and defend its borders? Our obligation is to serve, protect, and defend the citizens of the United States.

We are also taking strong measures to protect our Nation from radical Islamic terrorism. According to data provided by the Department of Justice, the vast majority of individuals convicted of terrorism and terrorism-related offenses since 9/11 came here from outside of our country. We have seen the attacks at home—from Boston to San Bernardino to the Pentagon and, yes, even the World Trade Center. We have seen the attacks in France, in Belgium, in Germany, and all over the world. It is not compassionate, but reckless, to allow uncontrolled entry from places where proper vetting cannot occur.

Those given the high honor of admission to the United States should support this country and love its people and its values. We cannot allow a beachhead of terrorism to form inside America. We cannot allow our Nation to become a sanctuary for extremists. That is why my administration has been working on improved vetting procedures, and we will shortly take new steps to keep our Nation safe and to keep those out who will do us harm.

As promised, I directed the Department of Defense to develop a plan to demolish and destroy ISIS, a network of lawless savages that have slaughtered Muslims and Christians, and men and women and children of all faiths and all beliefs. We will work with our allies, including our friends and allies in the Muslim world, to extinguish this vile enemy from our planet. I have also imposed new sanctions on entities and individuals who support Iran's ballistic missile program, and reaffirmed our unbreakable alliance with the State of Israel.

Finally, I have kept my promise to appoint a Justice to the United States Supreme Court from my list of 20 judges who will defend our Constitution. I am greatly honored to have Maureen Scalia with us in the gallery tonight. Thank you, Maureen. Her late, great husband, Antonin Scalia, will forever be a symbol of American justice. To fill his seat, we have chosen Judge Neil Gorsuch, a man of incredible skill and deep devotion to the law. He was confirmed unanimously to the Court of Appeals, and I am asking the Senate to swiftly approve his nomination.

Tonight, as I outline the next steps we must take as a country, we must honestly acknowledge the circumstances we inherited. Ninety-four million Americans are out of the labor force. Over 43 million people are now living in poverty, and over 43 million Americans are on food stamps. More than one in five people in their prime working years are not working. We have the worst financial recovery in 65 years. In the last 8 years, the past administration has put on more new debt

than nearly all of the other Presidents combined.

We have lost more than one-fourth of our manufacturing jobs since NAFTA was approved, and we have lost 60,000 factories since China joined the World Trade Organization in 2001. Our trade deficit in goods with the world last year was nearly \$800 billion. And overseas we have inherited a series of tragic foreign policy disasters. Solving these, and so many other pressing problems, will require us to work past the differences of party.

It will require us to tap into the American spirit that has overcome every challenge throughout our long and storied history. But to accomplish our goals at home and abroad, we must restart the engine of the American economy, making it easier for companies to do business in the United States, and much, much harder for companies to leave our country.

Right now, American companies are taxed at one of the highest rates anywhere in the world. My economic team is developing historic tax reform that will reduce the tax rate on our companies so they can compete and thrive anywhere and with anyone. It will be a big, big cut.

At the same time, we will provide massive tax relief for the middle class. We must create a level playing field for American companies and workers. Currently, when we ship products out of America; many other countries make us pay very high tariffs and taxes. But when foreign companies ship their products into America, we charge them nothing or almost nothing.

I just met with officials and workers from a great American company—Harley-Davidson. In fact, they proudly displayed five of their magnificent motorcycles, made in the USA, on the front lawn of the White House. They wanted me to ride one, and I said: No, thank you.

At our meeting, I asked them: How are you doing, how is business?

They said that it is good.

I asked them further: How are you doing with other countries, mainly international sales?

They told me—without even complaining because they have been so mistreated for so long that they have become used to it—that it is very hard to do business with other countries because they tax our goods at such a high rate. They said that in one case another country taxed their motorcycles at 100 percent. They weren't even asking for change, but I am. I believe strongly in free trade, but it also has to be fair trade. It has been a long time since we had fair trade.

The first Republican President, Abraham Lincoln, warned that “The abandonment of the protective policy by the American Government will produce want and ruin among our people.” Lincoln was right, and it is time we heeded his advice and his words.

I am not going to let America and its great companies and workers be taken

advantage of any longer. They have taken advantage of our country no longer.

I am going to bring back millions of jobs. Protecting our workers also means reforming our system of legal immigration. The current, outdated system depresses wages for our poorest workers and puts great pressure on taxpayers. Nations around the world, like Canada, Australia, and many others, have a merit-based immigration system.

It is a basic principle that those seeking to enter a country ought to be able to support themselves financially. Yet, in America, we do not enforce this rule, straining the very public resources that our poorest citizens rely upon.

According to the National Academy of Sciences, our current immigration system costs American taxpayers many billions of dollars a year. Switching away from this current system of lower-skilled immigration and, instead, adopting a merit-based system, we will have so many more benefits. It will save countless dollars, raise workers' wages, and help struggling families, including immigrant families, enter the middle class. They will do it quickly, and they will be very, very happy indeed.

I believe that real and positive immigration reform is possible, as long as we focus on the following goals: to improve jobs and wages for Americans, to strengthen our Nation's security, and to restore respect for our laws. If we are guided by the well-being of American citizens, then I believe Republicans and Democrats can work together to achieve an outcome that has eluded our country for decades.

Another Republican President, Dwight D. Eisenhower, initiated the last truly great national infrastructure program—the building of the interstate highway system. The time has come for a new program of national rebuilding. America has spent approximately \$6 trillion in the Middle East, all the while our infrastructure at home is crumbling. With this \$6 trillion, we could have rebuilt our country twice, and maybe even three times, if we had people who had the ability to negotiate.

To launch our national rebuilding, I will be asking Congress to approve legislation that produces a \$1 trillion investment in the infrastructure of the United States, financed through both public and private capital, creating millions of new jobs. This effort will be guided by two core principles: buy American and hire American.

Tonight, I am also calling on this Congress to repeal and replace ObamaCare, with reforms that expand choice, increase access, lower costs, and, at the same time, deprive better health care. Mandating every American to buy government-approved health insurance was never the right solution for our country. The way to make health insurance available to ev-

eryone is to lower the cost of health insurance, and that is what we are going to do.

ObamaCare premiums nationwide have increased by double and triple digits. As an example, Arizona went up 116 percent last year alone.

Governor Matt Bevin of Kentucky just said ObamaCare is failing in his State, the State of Kentucky, and it is unsustainable and collapsing. One-third of the counties have only one insurer, and they are losing them fast. They are losing them so fast. They are leaving, and many Americans have no choice at all. There is no choice left.

Remember when you were told that you could keep your doctor and keep your plan? We now know that all of those promises have been totally broken. ObamaCare is collapsing, and we must act decisively to protect all Americans.

Action is not a choice, it is a necessity. So I am calling on all Democrats and Republicans in Congress to work with us to save Americans from this imploding ObamaCare disaster.

Here are the principles that should guide Congress as we move to create a better healthcare system for all Americans:

First, we should ensure that Americans with preexisting conditions have access to coverage and that we have a stable transition for Americans currently enrolled in the healthcare exchanges.

Second, we should help Americans purchase their own coverage through the use of tax credits and expanded health savings accounts—but it must be the plan they want, not the plan forced on them by our government.

Third, we should give our State Governors the resources and flexibility they need with Medicaid to make sure no one is left out.

Fourth, we should implement legal reforms that protect patients and doctors from unnecessary costs that drive up the price of insurance and work to bring down the artificially high price of drugs, and bring them down immediately.

And finally, the time has come to give Americans the freedom to purchase health insurance across State lines, which will create a truly competitive national marketplace that will bring cost way down and provide far better care. So important.

Everything that is broken in our country can be fixed, every problem can be solved, and every hurting family can find healing and hope.

Our citizens deserve this and so much more. So why not join forces and finally get the job done, and get it done right? On this and so many other things, Democrats and Republicans should get together and unite for the good of our country and for the good of the American people.

My administration wants to work with Members of both parties to make child care accessible and affordable, to help ensure new parents have paid family leave, to invest in women's health,

to promote clean air and clean water, and to rebuild our military and our infrastructure.

True love for our people requires us to find common ground, to advance the common good, and to cooperate on behalf of every American child who deserves a much brighter future.

An incredible young woman is with us this evening who should serve as an inspiration to us all. Today is Rare Disease Day, and joining us in the gallery is a rare disease survivor, Megan Crowley.

Megan was diagnosed with Pompe disease, a rare and serious illness, when she was 15 months old. She was not expected to live past 5. On receiving this news, Megan's dad, John, fought with everything he had to save the life of his precious child. He founded a company to look for a cure and helped develop the drug that saved Megan's life. Today she is 20 years old and a sophomore at Notre Dame. Megan's story is about the unbounded power of a father's love for a daughter.

But our slow and burdensome approval process at the Food and Drug Administration keeps too many advances like the one that saved Megan's life from reaching those in need. If we slash the restraints—not just at the FDA, but across our government—then we will be blessed with far more miracles just like Megan. In fact, our children will grow up in a nation of miracles.

But to achieve this future, we must enrich the mind and the soul of every American child. Education is the civil rights issue of our time. I am calling upon Members of both parties to pass an education bill that funds school choice for disadvantaged youth, including millions of African-American and Latino children. These families should be free to choose the public, private, charter, magnet, religious, or home school that is right for them.

Joining us tonight in the gallery is a remarkable woman, Denisha Merriweather. As a young girl, Denisha struggled in school and failed third grade twice, but then she was able to enroll in a private center for learning—a great learning center—with the help of a tax credit and a scholarship program. Today, she is the first in her family to graduate not just from high school, but from college. Later this year, she will get her master's degree in social work.

We want all children to be able to break the cycle of poverty just like Denisha.

But to break the cycle of poverty, we must also break the cycle of violence. The murder rate in 2015 experienced its largest single-year increase in nearly half a century. In Chicago, more than 4,000 people were shot last year alone, and the murder rate so far this year has been even higher. This is not acceptable in our society.

Every American child should be able to grow up in a safe community, to attend a great school, and to have access

to a high-paying job. But to create this future, we must work with—not against—the men and women of law enforcement.

We must build bridges of cooperation and trust, not drive the wedge of disunity and—really it is what it is—division. It is pure, unadulterated division. We have to unify.

Police and sheriffs are members of our community. They are friends and neighbors; they are mothers and fathers, sons and daughters. And they leave behind loved ones every day who worry about whether or not they will come home safe and sound. We must support the incredible men and women of law enforcement.

And we must support the victims of crime. I have ordered the Department of Homeland Security to create an office to serve American victims. The office is called VOICE, Victims of Immigration Crime Engagement. We are providing a voice to those who have been ignored by our media and silenced by special interests.

Joining us in the audience tonight are four very brave Americans whose government failed them. Their names are Jamiel Shaw, Susan Oliver, Jenna Oliver, and Jessica Davis.

Jamiel's 17-year-old son was viciously murdered by an illegal immigrant gang member who had just been released from prison. Jamiel Shaw, Jr., was an incredible young man with unlimited potential who was getting ready to go to college where he would have excelled as a great college quarterback, but he never got the chance. His father, who is in the audience tonight, has become a very good friend of mine.

Jamiel, thank you.

Also with us are Susan Oliver and Jessica Davis. Their husbands, Deputy Sheriff Danny Oliver and Detective Michael Davis, were slain in the line of duty in California. They were pillars of their community. These brave men were viciously gunned down by an illegal immigrant with a criminal record and two prior deportations who should have never been in our country.

Sitting with Susan is her daughter, Jenna.

Jenna, I want you to know that your father was a hero, and that tonight you have the love of an entire country supporting you and praying for you.

To Jamiel, Jenna, Susan, and Jessica: I want you to know that we will never stop fighting for justice. Your loved ones will never ever be forgotten. We will always honor their memory.

Finally, to keep America safe, we must provide the men and women of the United States military with the tools they need to prevent war and—if they must—to fight and to win.

I am sending Congress a budget that rebuilds the military, eliminates the defense sequester, and calls for one of the largest increases in national defense spending in American history.

My budget will also increase funding for our veterans. Our veterans have de-

livered for this Nation, and now we must deliver for them.

The challenges we face as a nation are great, but our people are even greater. And none are greater or braver than those who fight for America in uniform.

We are blessed to be joined tonight by Carryn Owens, the widow of a U.S. Navy Special Operator, Senior Chief William Ryan Owens. Ryan died as he lived, a warrior and a hero, battling against terrorism and securing our Nation.

I spoke to our great General Mattis just now, who reconfirmed that—and I quote:

"Ryan was a part of a highly successful raid that generated large amounts of vital intelligence that will lead to many more victories in the future against our enemies."

Ryan's legacy is etched into eternity.

And Ryan is looking down right now, you know that, and he is very happy, because I think he just broke a record.

For, as the Bible teaches us, there is no greater act of love than to lay down one's life for one's friends. Ryan laid down his life for his friends, for his country, and for our freedom, and we will never forget Ryan.

To those allies who wonder what kind of a friend America will be, look no further than the heroes who wear our uniform. Our foreign policy calls for a direct, robust, and meaningful engagement with the world. It is American leadership based on vital security interests that we share with our allies all across the globe.

We strongly support NATO, an alliance forged through the bonds of two World Wars that dethroned fascism, and a Cold War, and defeated communism. But our partners must meet their financial obligations. And now, based on our very strong and frank discussions, they are beginning to do just that. In fact, I can tell you the money is pouring in. Very nice.

We expect our partners, whether in NATO, the Middle East, or in the Pacific, to take a direct and meaningful role in both strategic and military operations, and pay their fair share of the cost. Have to do that.

We will respect historic institutions, but we will respect the sovereign rights of all nations, and they have to respect our rights as a nation, also. Free nations are the best vehicle for expressing the will of the people, and America respects the right of all nations to chart their own path.

My job is not to represent the world. My job is to represent the United States of America. But we know that America is better off when there is less conflict, not more. We must learn from the mistakes of the past. We have seen the war and the destruction that have ravaged and raged throughout the world, all across the world.

The only long-term solution for these humanitarian disasters, in many cases, is to create the conditions where displaced persons can safely return home

and begin the long, long process of rebuilding.

America is willing to find new friends, and to forge new partnerships, where shared interests align. We want harmony and stability, not war and conflict. We want peace wherever peace can be found.

America is friends today with former enemies. Some of our closest allies, decades ago, fought on the opposite side of these terrible, terrible wars. This history should give us all faith in the possibilities for a better world.

Hopefully, the 250th year for America will see a world that is more peaceful, more just, and more free. On our 100th anniversary, in 1876, citizens from across our Nation came to Philadelphia to celebrate America's centennial. At that celebration, the country's builders and artists and inventors showed off their wonderful creations.

Alexander Graham Bell displayed his telephone for the first time. Remington unveiled the first typewriter. An early attempt was made at electric light. Thomas Edison showed an automatic telegraph and an electric pen.

Imagine the wonders our country could know in America's 250th year. Think of the marvels we can achieve if we simply set free the dreams of our people. Cures to the illnesses that have always plagued us are not too much to hope. American footprints on distant worlds are not too big a dream. Millions lifted from welfare to work is not too much to expect. And streets where mothers are safe from fear, schools where children learn in peace, and jobs where Americans prosper and grow, are not too much to ask.

When we have all of this, we will have made America greater than ever before for all Americans. This is our vision. This is our mission. But we can only get there together.

We are one people with one destiny. We all bleed the same blood. We all salute the same great American flag, and we all are made by the same God. When we fulfill this vision, when we celebrate our 250 years of glorious freedom, we will look back on tonight as when this new chapter of American greatness began.

The time for small thinking is over. The time for trivial fights is behind us. We just need the courage to share the dreams that fill our hearts, the bravery to express the hopes that stir our souls, and the confidence to turn those hopes and those dreams into action.

From now on, America will be empowered by our aspirations, not burdened by our fears; inspired by the future, not bound by failures of the past; and guided by our vision, not blinded by our doubts.

I am asking all citizens to embrace this renewal of the American spirit. I am asking all Members of Congress to join me in dreaming big, and bold, and daring things for our country. And I am asking everyone watching tonight to seize this moment and believe in yourselves. Believe in your future, and believe, once more, in America.

Thank you. God bless you, and God bless these United States.

(Applause, the Members rising.)

At 10 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m., the President of the United States, accompanied by the committee of escort, retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The Assistant to the Sergeant at Arms escorted the invited guests from the Chamber in the following order:

The members of the President's Cabinet; the Chief Justice of the United States and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court; the Dean of the Diplomatic Corps.

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares the joint session of the two Houses now dissolved.

Accordingly, at 10 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m., the joint session of the two Houses was dissolved.

The Members of the Senate retired to their Chamber.

MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT REFERRED TO THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE ON THE STATE OF THE UNION

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the message of the President be referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered printed.

The motion was agreed to.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 609. An act to designate the Department of Veterans Affairs health care center in Center Township, Butler County, Pennsylvania, as the "Abie Abraham VA Clinic".

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 1, 2017, at 10 a.m., for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

670. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Robert R. Ruark, United States Marine Corps, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 502(b)); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

671. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence, Depart-

ment of Defense, transmitting a letter stating that the annual report on the current and future military strategy of Iran will be delivered to the Congress by the end of April, 2017; to the Committee on Armed Services.

672. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's direct final rule — Use of Ozone-Depleting Substances [Docket No.: FDA-2015-N-1355] (RIN: 0910-AH36) received February 27, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

673. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — VNT1 protein in potato; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2014-0457; FRL-9957-97] received February 22, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

674. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Revisions to Public Inspection File Requirements — Broadcaster Correspondence File and Cable Principal Headend Location [MB Docket No.: 16-161] received February 23, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

675. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations. (Roma and San Isidro, Texas) [MB Docket No.: 05-142] (RM-11220) received February 21, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

676. A letter from the Deputy Chief Information Security Officer, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's Fiscal Year 2016 FISMA report and the Agency Privacy Management Report, pursuant to 44 U.S.C. 3553(c); Public Law 113-283, Sec. 2(a); (128 Stat. 3076); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

677. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office for International Affairs and Seafood Inspection, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fish and Fish Product Import Provisions of the Marine Mammal Protection Act [Docket No.: 0907301201-6406-03] (RIN: 0648-AY15) received February 27, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

678. A letter from the Assistant to the Board, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Board's final rule — Rules of Practice for Hearings [Docket No.: R-1543] (RIN: 7100 AE-55) received February 23, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

679. A letter from the Director of Civil Works, Army Corps of Engineers, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Issuance and Reissuance of Nationwide Permits [COE-2015-0017] (RIN: 0710-AA73) received February 21, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

680. A letter from the Office of Program Manager, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Office of the Secretary (00REG), Office of Regulation Policy and

Management (00REG), Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's interim final rule — VA Veteran-Owned Small Business Verification Guidelines (RIN: 2900-AP93) received February 22, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SESSIONS. Committee on Rules. House Resolution 156. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1004) to amend chapter 3 of title 5, United States Code, to require the publication of information relating to pending agency regulatory actions, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1009) to amend title 44, United States Code, to require the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs to review regulations, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-21). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. TIBERI. Joint Economic Committee. Report of the Joint Economic Committee on the 2017 Economic Report of the President (Rept. 115-22). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. YOUNG of Iowa (for himself, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. DONOVAN):

H.R. 1238. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to make the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security for Health Affairs responsible for coordinating the efforts of the Department of Homeland Security related to food, agriculture, and veterinary defense against terrorism, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina (for himself, Mr. LANCE, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. COLE, and Ms. TITUS):

H.R. 1239. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Defense to make grants to support the study of world languages in elementary schools and secondary schools; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GARAMENDI (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, and Mr. HUNTER):

H.R. 1240. A bill to require a certain percentage of liquefied natural gas and crude oil exports be transported on vessels documented under the laws of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of

such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LAMALFA (for himself, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. JONES, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. PANETTA, and Ms. KAPTUR):

H.R. 1241. A bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to require a school food authority to make publicly available any waiver of the Buy American requirement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia (for himself, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. BEYER, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. MOORE, Mr. EVANS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. RASKIN, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. LEE, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. SOTO, Mr. DELANEY, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN):

H.R. 1242. A bill to establish the 400 Years of African-American History Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia (for himself, Mr. MARINO, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. POLIS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLAY, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. HIMES, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. LEE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. POCAN, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. BARRAGAN, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. PETERS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. RUSH, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. NOLAN):

H.R. 1243. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Defense to use only human-based methods for training members of the Armed Forces in the treatment of severe combat injuries; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. POSEY, Ms. NORTON, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 1244. A bill to clarify the National Credit Union Administration authority to improve credit union safety and soundness; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CUMMINGS (for himself, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. MOORE, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. COHEN, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. LEE, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. NORTON, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. WELCH, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. POCAN, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Mr. SHERMAN):

H.R. 1245. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to allow for the importation of affordable and safe drugs by wholesale distributors, pharmacies, and individuals; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CURBELO of Florida (for himself and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ):

H.R. 1246. A bill to exempt health insurance of residents of United States territories from the annual fee on health insurance providers; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on

Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DONOVAN (for himself and Mr. CLAY):

H.R. 1247. A bill to extend the period of availability of the Multinational Species Conservation Funds Semipostal Stamp, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ESPAILLAT (for himself, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. RASKIN):

H.R. 1248. A bill to amend the National Security Act of 1947 to prohibit individuals who threaten to destroy the Government from participating in or attending meetings of the National Security Council, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, Intelligence (Permanent Select), and Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK (for himself and Mr. MCCAUL):

H.R. 1249. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require a multiyear acquisition strategy of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. FLEISCHMANN:

H.R. 1250. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to use the testimonials of former violent extremists or their associates in order to counter terrorist recruitment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. GARAMENDI (for himself, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. NORTON, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POCAN, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Ms. HANABUSA):

H.R. 1251. A bill to provide for cost-of-living increases for certain Federal benefits programs based on increases in the Consumer Price Index for the elderly; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs, Oversight and Government Reform, and Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana (for himself and Mr. MCCAUL):

H.R. 1252. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide for certain acquisition authorities for the Under Secretary of Management of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. KILMER (for himself, Ms. HERERA BEUTLER, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas):

H.R. 1253. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to make loans

and loan guarantees for constructing or renovating, or planning construction or renovation of, qualified psychiatric and substance abuse treatment facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LoBIONDO:

H.R. 1254. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a pilot program under which eligible veterans may elect to receive hospital care and medical services at non-Department of Veterans Affairs facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico (for himself, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, and Mr. PEARCE):

H.R. 1255. A bill to increase research, education, and treatment for cerebral cavernous malformations; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MACARTHUR:

H.R. 1256. A bill to remove from the John H. Chafee Coastal Barrier Resources System certain properties in New Jersey; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MEEKS (for himself and Mr. HULTGREN):

H.R. 1257. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to require the Securities Exchange Commission to refund or credit excess payments made to the Commission; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. PERRY (for himself and Mr. McCAUL):

H.R. 1258. A bill to make technical corrections to the Homeland Security Act of 2002; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee (for himself, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. BOST, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. POLIQUIN, Mr. BANKS of Indiana, and Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico):

H.R. 1259. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the removal or demotion of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs based on performance or misconduct, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 1260. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to provide assistance to eligible nonprofit organizations to provide specialized housing and supportive services for elderly persons who are the primary caregivers of children that are related to such persons; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. THORNBERRY:

H.R. 1261. A bill to clarify the definition of navigable waters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. TIBERI (for himself and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 1262. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the tax treatment of certain life insurance contract transactions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 1263. A bill to exclude from the application of Executive Order 13796 certain Iraqi and Afghani special immigrants and refugees, to render certain Afghans eligible for Priority 2 processing under the refugee resettlement priority system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 1264. A bill to provide an exemption from rules and regulations of the Bureau of

Consumer Financial protection for community financial institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. KELLY of Mississippi:

H. Con. Res. 30. Concurrent resolution recognizing the 75th Anniversary of the establishment of the United States Navy Seabees and the Navy personnel who comprise the construction force for the Navy and the Marine Corps; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mrs. BEATTY):

H. Con. Res. 31. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that John Arthur "Jack" Johnson should receive a posthumous pardon for the racially motivated conviction in 1913 that diminished the athletic, cultural, and historic significance of Jack Johnson and unduly tarnished his reputation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana (for himself, Mr. McCAUL, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. LANCE, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. MARINO, Ms. MOORE, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. PETERS):

H. Res. 157. A resolution expressing support for the designation of the last day of February each year, as "Rare Disease Day"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. LEVIN):

H. Res. 158. A resolution celebrating the history of the Detroit River with the 16-year commemoration of the International Underground Railroad Memorial Monument, comprised of the Gateway to Freedom Monument in Detroit, Michigan, and the Tower of Freedom Monument in Windsor, Ontario, Canada; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MEEKS (for himself, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. WALZ, and Ms. PLASKETT):

H. Res. 159. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that infrastructure spending bills should include development programs that recruit and train individuals from communities with high unemployment rates; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

5. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of California, relative to Senate Resolution No. 12, urging the President of the United States and the Congress to express their support for a woman's fundamental right to control her own reproductive decisions, as well as their support for access to comprehensive reproductive health care; which was referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitu-

tion to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. YOUNG of Iowa:

H.R. 1238.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina:

H.R. 1239.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

As described in Article 1, Section 1, "all legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives."

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution provides Congress with the authority to "provide for the common Defense and general Welfare" of Americans.

The intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States government, including those under Title 50 of the United States Code, are carried out to support the national security interests of the United States, to support and assist the armed forces of the United States, and to support the President in the execution of the foreign policy of the United States.

In the Department of Education Organization Act (P.L. 96-88), Congress declared that "the establishment of a Department of Education is in the public interest, will promote the general welfare of the United States, will help ensure that education issues receive proper treatment at the Federal level, and will enable the Federal Government to coordinate its education activities more effectively." The Department of Education's mission is to "promote student achievement and preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access."

By Mr. GARAMENDI:

H.R. 1240.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. LAMALFA:

H.R. 1241.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia:

H.R. 1242.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia:

H.R. 1243.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 (Clauses 1, 14, and 18), which grants Congress the power to provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; to make rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces; and to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 1244.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. CUMMINGS:

H.R. 1245.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 . . . "To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and

among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.”

By Mr. CURBELO of Florida:

H.R. 1246.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 Clause 3 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. DONOVAN:

H.R. 1247.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. ESPAILLAT:

H.R. 1248.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article One of the United States Constitution, Section 8, Clause 18:

The Congress shall have Power—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof

or

Article One of the United States Constitution, Section 8, Clause 3:

The Congress shall have Power—To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes;

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 1249.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. FLEISCHMANN:

H.R. 1250.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. GARAMENDI:

H.R. 1251.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana:

H.R. 1252.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. KILMER:

H.R. 1253.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1.

By Mr. LOBIONDO:

H.R. 1254.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8, Article 1 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico:

H.R. 1255.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII

By Mr. MACARTHUR:

H.R. 1256.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. MEEKS:

H.R. 1257.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The necessary and proper clause of the Constitution (Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18)

By Mr. PERRY:

H.R. 1258.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee:

H.R. 1259.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 1260.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8: The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States

By Mr. THORNBERRY:

H.R. 1261.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. TIBERI:

H.R. 1262.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 1263.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 1264.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (“To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes”).

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 24: Mr. HARPER, Mr. COLE, and Mr. HUDSON.

H.R. 38: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. MOOLENAAR, and Mr. REED.

H.R. 113: Mr. O’ROURKE.

H.R. 179: Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. GIBBS.

H.R. 217: Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.R. 253: Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 289: Mrs. LOVE, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. STEWART, Mr. VALADAO, and Mr. MACARTHUR.

H.R. 299: Ms. ROSEN, Mr. DUNN, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. CORREA, Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. HIGGINS of New

York, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. RUIZ, Mrs. NOEM, and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 350: Mr. CHABOT and Mr. RICE of South Carolina.

H.R. 367: Mr. FLEISCHMANN.

H.R. 376: Mr. POCAN and Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 380: Mr. GALLAGHER and Mr. ROSKAM.

H.R. 388: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.

H.R. 429: Mr. BERGMAN.

H.R. 449: Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 453: Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.R. 490: Mr. BIGGS.

H.R. 544: Mr. MOULTON and Mr. HILL.

H.R. 548: Ms. STEFANIK and Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 553: Mr. ROSKAM and Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 568: Mr. SARBANES and Ms. SHEA-POR-TER.

H.R. 578: Mr. KATKO.

H.R. 592: Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. YARMUTH, and Mr. GRIFFITH.

H.R. 608: Mr. PERRY.

H.R. 611: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.

H.R. 613: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. LONG, Mr. BABIN, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. MAST.

H.R. 619: Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH.

H.R. 632: Ms. DELAULO and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 639: Mr. GIBBS.

H.R. 644: Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mrs. HARTZLER, and Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana.

H.R. 657: Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 672: Mr. SCHNEIDER, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. MAST, and Mr. JOYCE of Ohio.

H.R. 673: Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. BANKS of Indiana, Mr. DESANTIS, and Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 676: Ms. SPEIER and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 685: Mr. VISCLOSKEY.

H.R. 712: Mr. DELANEY.

H.R. 721: Mr. WITTMAN, Ms. TITUS, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. LONG, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. HILL, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. GALLAGHER, and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 747: Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 750: Mr. DEFazio.

H.R. 755: Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota.

H.R. 761: Mrs. NOEM.

H.R. 785: Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. HUDSON, and Mr. TROTT.

H.R. 799: Mrs. LAWRENCE.

H.R. 804: Ms. JACKSON LEE and Mr. CLEAVER.

H.R. 813: Ms. ESTY, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, and Mr. CARBAJAL.

H.R. 816: Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. O’ROURKE.

H.R. 822: Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 828: Mr. KING of New York and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 830: Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 849: Mr. FERGUSON.

H.R. 853: Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.R. 871: Mr. FASO and Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 879: Mr. CRIST.

H.R. 914: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. ESPAILLAT, and Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 964: Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 970: Ms. BARRAGÁN.

H.R. 978: Mr. DELANEY.

H.R. 1002: Ms. ESTY and Mrs. DINGELL.

H.R. 1006: Ms. BARRAGÁN.

H.R. 1013: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 1016: Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 1022: Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 1026: Mr. BERGMAN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. STEFANIK, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MOOLENAAR, and Mr. KIND.

H.R. 1031: Mr. FARENTHOLD and Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

H. R. 1049: Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.

H.R. 1057: Mr. LATTI, Mr. KINZINGER, Mr. KIND, and Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 1060: Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. NOLAN, and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.

H.R. 1089: Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 1090: Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 1092: Mr. CICILLINE and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 1098: Mr. GIBBS.

H.R. 1101: Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. FASO, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. HUIZENGA, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. SESSIONS, Mrs. WALORSKI, and Mr. BOST.

H.R. 1103: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, and Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 1111: Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 1114: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 1130: Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 1132: Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 1133: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.

H.R. 1156: Mr. PITTINGER and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 1171: Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 1174: Mrs. COMSTOCK.

H.R. 1186: Mr. MCHEERY.

H.R. 1205: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 1214: Mr. DENHAM and Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana.

H.R. 1235: Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. TONKO, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. GRIJALVA, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. LAMBORN, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. BEYER, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. GALLEGGO, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. KEATING, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. SIREs, Mr. ROKITA, Mrs. DINGELL,

Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H.J. Res. 31: Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. HECK, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. POLIS, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Mr. YARMUTH.

H.J. Res. 48: Ms. BONAMICI and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.J. Res. 50: Mr. ARRINGTON.

H.J. Res. 51: Mr. KING of Iowa.

H.J. Res. 59: Mr. BABIN.

H.J. Res. 75: Ms. BARRAGÁN.

H.J. Res. 83: Ms. FOX, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida, Mrs. HARTZLER, and Mr. WALBERG.

H. Con. Res. 10: Mr. CLEAVER and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

H. Con. Res. 15: Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. MOORE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. COHEN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUSH, Ms. HANABUSA, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. EVANS, Mr. RASKIN, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H. Res. 31: Mr. YARMUTH, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. HANABUSA, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. ROSEN, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. COOK, and Mr. SCHRADER.

H. Res. 46: Mr. ROSKAM.

H. Res. 58: Mr. VEASEY.

H. Res. 75: Mr. NOLAN and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H. Res. 90: Mrs. LAWRENCE.

H. Res. 102: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. HASTINGS.

H. Res. 108: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, and Mr. MCNERNEY.

H. Res. 111: Mr. LEVIN, Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. TITUS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. ESTY, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. KIND, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. PINGREE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H. Res. 130: Ms. PINGREE, Ms. ESTY, and Mr. YARMUTH.

H. Res. 135: Mr. MOULTON, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. COLE, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. MOOLENAAR.

H. Res. 143: Mr. SABLAN.

H. Res. 144: Mr. SABLAN.

H. Res. 146: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.

H. Res. 152: Mr. PETERSON, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. EMMER, Mr. KATKO, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. HUDSON, and Mr. ROUZER.

H. Res. 154: Ms. ESHOO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. TONKO, Mr. WELCH, Mr. KEATING, Mr. COHEN, Mr. POCAN, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. LOEBSACK.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

The amendment to be offered by Representative MITCHELL, or a designee, to H.R. 1009 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

19. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Council of State Governments, Eastern Regional Conference, New York, relative to Resolution No. HC2016-01 in support of continuing the Medicaid State/Federal Partnership; which was referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

20. Also, a petition of the Board of Chosen Freeholders, Hudson County, New Jersey, relative to Resolution No. 26-01-2017, urging the Congress and President-Elect of the United States not to repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was referred jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Education and the Workforce, Ways and Means, Appropriations, the Judiciary, Natural Resources, House Administration, and Rules.